DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 465 FL 023 795

AUTHOR Hussein, Anwar Ahmed
TITLE Preparation of Administrators for English as a Second Language Programs.
PUB DATE May 93
NOTE 130p.; Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Applied Linguistics; Curriculum Design; Educational Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Experiential Learning; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Professional Development; *Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; *Relevance (Education); *Second Language Programs; Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to assess the adequacy of current Master's and doctoral English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and applied linguistics program curricula in preparing administrators acquainted with administrative theories. Secondary objectives were to determine the appropriateness of such programs in preparing students for teaching, research, and publication responsibilities, the level of satisfaction that ESL and applied linguistics specialists have with their training, and graduates' perceived level of success in supervising their programs. Data were gathered in a survey of 100 program administrators. Results show that graduates of ESL and applied linguistics graduate programs were very well prepared for their academic responsibilities but not for their administrative duties. As a result, 79 percent of respondents would like current programs to fill this gap. However, respondents reported that they were successful in supervising their programs due to administrative skills acquired through practice and experience, seeking help from other administrators and in-service training. Contains five pages of references. Appendices contain the cover letters, the survey instrument, and a list of institutions surveyed. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 465

PREPARATION OF ADMINISTRATORS FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

by

Anwar Ahmed Hussein

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 1993

FL023795

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Anwar Ahmed
Hussein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C 1

PREPARATION OF ADMINISTRATORS FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

by

Anwar Ahmed Hussein

has been approved

May 1993

APPROVED:

______________________, Chairperson

____

____

Supervisory Committee

ACCEPTED:

____

Division Director

____

Dean, Graduate College

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at assessing the adequacy of the current master's and doctoral English as a Second Language (ESL) and applied linguistics graduate programs curricula for preparing effective administrators who are acquainted with the principles of administrative theories. Secondary study goals entailed determining the appropriateness of such programs in preparing their students for teaching, research, and publication duties, determining the level of satisfaction that ESL and applied linguistics specialists have with their training, and ascertaining their perceived level of success in supervising their programs and the reasons behind their effectiveness. Questionnaires were sent to 143 program administrators. Of these, exactly 100 (69.9%) were returned. The data were analyzed utilizing the statistical package SAS. Data analysis disclosed that graduates of ESL and applied linguistics programs were very well prepared for their academic responsibilities but not for their administrative duties. As a result 79% of the respondents would like the current programs to fill this gap. However, the participants reported that they were successful in supervising their programs due to administrative skills acquired through practice and experience, seeking help from other administrators and in-service training.

For my uncle and advocate

Abu Bashaar

& my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am forever thankful to Allah (God) for His mercy and guidance. I am also grateful for the leadership and patience of my committee chair, Professor Robert H. Fenske. I would also like to thank my committee members, Professor James W. Ney and Dr. Quentin J. Bogart, for their help with this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ix

Chapter

1 Introduction 1

Background for the Study 1

Conceptual Framework 8

Summary 12

2 Literature Review 14

ESL Program Administration Studies 14

Studies of Other Academic Departments' Administrators 27

Related Literature 38

Summary 46

3 Methodology 47

Methods of Data Collection 47

Collection of Data 52

Methods of Data Analysis 52

Summary 54

4 Results 55

Administrative Training 57

Administrative Responsibilities of Graduate ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs' Directors 60

Chapter Page

Administrative Problems 65

Organizational Placement of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs 79

ESL and Applied Linguistics Program Sizes .. 81

Summary 83

5 Discussion 85

Appropriateness of Administrative Training . 86

Preparation for Administrative Duties 92

Placement of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs 98

6 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations 103

Summary 103

Conclusions and Implications 106

Recommendations 108

BIBLIOGRAPHY 111

APPENDIX

A FIRST MAILING COVER LETTER 117

B SECOND FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER 119

C INSTRUMENT OF STUDY (QUESTIONNAIRE) 121

D PUBLISHED ARTICLE IN APRIL/MAY, 1993 ISSUE OF TESOL MATTERS DESCRIBING THE STUDY AND URGING CURRENT DIRECTORS PARTICIPATION 128

E LIST OF POPULATION OF THE STUDY REPRESENTED BY INSTITUTION 132

APPENDIX Page

F CHI SQUARE STATISTICS TEST OF INDEPENDENCE 138

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Administrative Training Offered by Programs from which the Current Directors Graduated ... 58

2 Preparation for Administrative Duties 58

3 Significance of Including Administrative Training in Graduate ESL and Applied Linguistic Programs 60

4 Preparation for Administrative Responsibilities 61

5 NPAR1WAY PROCEDURE for Student Advising Duty Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE Classified by Variable ROLE 62

6 NPAR1WAY PROCEDURE for Materials Preparation Duty, Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE classified by Variable ROLE 63

7 NPAR1WAY PROCEDURE for Curriculum Design Duty Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE Classified by Variable ROLE 63

8 NPAR1WAY Procedure for Other (Research) Duty Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE Classified by Variable ROLE 64

9 Satisfaction with Academic and Administrative Preparation 72

10 Reasons for Administrative Effectiveness 73

11 Effectiveness of ESL and Applied Linguistics Program Directors 76

12 Sources of Administrative Training 77

13 Length of Time as an Administrator 78

14 Places of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs 81

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

15 Sizes of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs 81

16 Roles of ESL and Applied Linguistics programs Directors 82

Chapter 1

Introduction

Background for the Study

The teaching of English as a Second Language (ESL) field began to emerge as a profession in the United States in the 1940s. Over this half-century period, one major area has received very little research, discussion or evaluation in the literature: ESL program administration. The administrative duties of an ESL program director/division chair, regardless of its place in the organizational structure of the institution, are planning and setting goals for an ESL program, recruiting and retaining staff and students, evaluating an ESL program and its staff, developing, requesting and allocating a budget, designing curricula and preparing materials, advising students and other miscellaneous responsibilities. Other important issues that the director of an ESL program should be aware of are professional development, responsibilities and duties of the faculty, evaluation procedures, grievance procedures and dismissal policy, and involving faculty in program administration. Another area of primary concern to the ESL administrator is the attraction, and program completion of students. The ESL administrator is concerned with a myriad of other issues no less important. Among these concerns are two of direct interest to this study, mainly, financing and the location of the program within the institution.

The ESL program administrator or division chair (in cases where ESL has its own department) must be acquainted with some essential administrative skills to effectively manage the aforementioned issues. His/her position, as an administrator or division chair, is critical because it "is the most taxing, the most challenging, the most hazardous in several ways, and the most important" (Coffin, 1979, p.81). The administrator or the division chair has also been characterized as "the significant and essential link between the faculty and administration at most institutions of higher learning" (Fisher, 1977, p.5). Roach (1976) contends that eighty percent of all administrative decisions take place at the department level. To mention a few, such decisions entail promotion, tenure, raises, and budgeting decisions.

In addition to these administrative functions, the program administrator or division chair has been characterized as an instructional catalyst (Jennerich, 1978). The central role of the chairman on the academic/ instructional continuum is clear because "no one else can see clearly a department's unique possibilities for serving the real needs of students or of the profession." (Smith, 1979, p.75). Given the significance of such individuals to the higher education enterprise, they have to be acquainted with the competencies and skills that enable them to perform their delegated responsibility effectively and efficiently.

The present study attempts to shed some light on the effectiveness of current ESL program administrators and division chairs, to explore what problems they encounter as administrators and to decide whether it is essential that these administrators acquire management and leadership training.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

Teaching English as a second language is a worldwide activity. Nevertheless, the present study is limited to the ESL programs at American colleges and universities which offer the Master and/or the Doctoral degree in ESL or applied linguistics. The American institutions have been chosen because they are the primary schools in the world from which most ESL professionals graduate. That is, ESL and applied linguistics programs in American institutions serve the needs of adults who are planning to teach and administer such programs at the university levels either here or in foreign countries. Thus, the directors, coordinators, administrators or division chairs of these programs are chosen to serve as the population which the researcher intends to study.

Purpose of the Study

The present study was designed to investigate whether ESL and applied linguistics program administrators, at the college and university level, received the appropriate training for the managerial responsibilities of their positions. These administrators are graduates with classroom teaching experience. Their preparation may be adequate for the academic context of the profession, but administrative positions require a different type of expertise. Administrative responsibilities require knowledge, skills and abilities in areas such as goal setting, decision making, group dynamics, managerial problem solving, time management, task analysis, human resources development, needs assessment, and budget planning. Such management skills have not been and are not currently included in programs leading to linguistics or ESL degrees. Nonetheless, the programs are administered by academicians who have largely learned their management skills "on the job". How well do these administrators believe they meet their administrative responsibilities? Are they satisfied with their preparation for administrative responsibilities? Could graduate programs be modified to improve management skills?

This study was expected to discern whether it is desirable to integrate management and leadership courses into the curriculum development of applied linguistics and ESL programs. More specifically, this study represented an initial effort to gauge the adequacy of the current master and doctoral programs curricula for preparing graduates for both academic and managerial duties in ESL programs.

Research Questions

The researcher's intention was to provide competent answers to the following questions:

I. What kinds of administrative training do the master and doctoral ESL and applied linguistics graduate programs offer to their graduate students?

II. What are the responsibilities and problems an ESL or applied linguistics program director faces pertaining to the administrative aspects of the program?

III. Did the administrative training components, if any, of the program from which the ESL or applied linguistics programs directors graduated, provide them with the appropriate training for administrative duties?

IV. What level of satisfaction do current ESL and applied linguistics program directors have with the graduate training of the programs from which they graduated?

V. What is the relationship between the current directors' level of satisfaction and the perceived level of effectiveness of the master and doctoral ESL and applied linguistics programs in preparing them for their duties?

VI. What elements such as new courses and internships might be included in ESL master's and doctoral programs to improve preparation for administrative responsibilities?

Significance of the Study

The present study is vital for current and prospective ESL and applied linguistics programs for a number of reasons. First, it is expected to aid such program managers in evaluating their curricula and in designing management and leadership courses that graduate effective prospective program administrators who have been schooled in management and leadership practices. Second, such management and leadership courses are expected to produce managers who are acquainted with the processes of budgeting, curricula planning, faculty recruitment, evaluation, retention and academic governance procedures. In brief, the significance of this study stems from the need to prepare managers and leaders who are able to 1) design a budget, 2) request and justify positions, 3) recruit and make instructional assignments and 4) evaluate performance, curricula, faculty, students and the program as a whole.

Drawing upon the analysis of the perceptions of current ESL administrators pertaining to adequate administrative skills, appropriate training and preparation, and other related demographic data, a strategy may be proposed to:

I. Evaluate the master and doctoral programs to determine whether they adequately prepare students in all subject-areas and skills including publication and administration. If inadequacies are determined, then recommendations will be proposed to:

II. Design supervisory or management courses that offer analyses and case studies in order to develop the conceptual skills for those who are going into ESL administration.

III. Propose an ESL administrative traineeship in the graduate programs through which one might develop skills by working for a period of time as an administrative intern.

IV. Recommend that all new ESL employees, including instructors, spend some time during their first few months of employment in the administrative offices of the program.

Contribution to Research

The present study constitutes an integration of the available literature as well as an addition to empirical findings. Of the few studies which have been conducted on ESL program administration, none have explored the needs of prospective ESL educators and managers through studying the present ESL program administrators at the college or university level. Furthermore, none of those studies focused on the problems that the current ESL administrators are experiencing as a result of the lack of management and leadership courses which qualify them for the position. The significance of designing new management and leadership courses in ESL and applied linguistics programs, from the perspective of current programs administrators, has not been investigated by any of the previous studies. Thus, this study is investigating a new topic which both complements and integrates the previous research.

Conceptual Framework

The need for good management and a study of relevant theory stem from the fact that good management, accomplished at all levels, contributes greatly to achieving the objectives of an organization. Weinbach (1990, p.12) defines management as "those specific functions performed by persons within the work setting that are intended to promote productivity and organizational goal attainment." According to Deegan (1981) the major management functions are: planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, directing and evaluating.

These functions constitute the major components of all management theories. There are several administrative theories that dominated the sphere of management. The earliest identifiable theories of management, collectively, were labeled scientific management. Scientific management was based on a number of assumptions about people and their behavior in the work place. It assumed that workers are motivated primarily by economic concerns. They act rationally. They prefer simple tasks, and they require and want guidance and supervision to help them with their work. If one subscribes to this view of human beings, certain management principles and behaviors follow. The work of the manager should involve the design and application of better ways to increase worker productivity.

Another group of theories were referred to as administrative management. Proponents of administrative management believed that good management could be taught. Persons who apply administrative management principles could be successful in performing the manager's tasks. We engage in management in all human activities. People can be taught to do a better job of management wherever they manage if they adhere to the basic principles of administrative management. These principles include: division of work, authority and responsibility, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to the general interest, remuneration (fair, rewarding of effort), reasonableness, centralization, scalar chain (line of authority, gangplank principle), order, equity, stability of tenure of personnel, initiative, and esprit de corps (union is strength) (Wren, 1972; George, 1972, Cited by Weinbach, 1990).

A third identifiable component of what is collectively referred to as classical management theory is bureaucratic management. Bureaucratic management is characterized by: a vertical organizational hierarchy, well-defined rules that limit functions, promotion and other rewards based on demonstrated technical competence, communication channels which are formal and rigid, job security for full time employees, division of labor, and emphasis on written documentation (Weinbach, 1990).

A bureaucracy is very logical. Its strict adherence to rather impersonal and unresponsive principles makes it a natural for many human service agencies, especially those large ones that serve great numbers of people. Organization around bureaucratic principles makes it possible to retain control over a large number of people and their activities. A bureaucracy offers a high level of certainty to employees who might otherwise have difficulty navigating their way within a large organization.

While classical theorists perceived managers as rational people capable of possessing the necessary knowledge to make the right decisions, writers who have been critical of classical theorists have had a different perception of managers. They viewed managers as pragmatists, making acceptable decisions based on limited information and with the knowledge that even good decisions can not guarantee success. Accordingly, several management theories are suggested. These theories include the modern structuralists, human relations, contingency approaches, and participative management theories.

The structuralist theorists describe the organization as heavily influenced by its external environment. They assume that there is inevitably a lack of goal congruence among persons who work in an organization. This, necessarily results in a conflict. An important function of managers, the structuralist theorists suggest, is the control and management of conflict in order to keep it at a tolerable and productive level. Insights into conflict within organizations and the inevitable stress between the organization and its external environment are important contributions to our study of management. They help us to better understand the importance of managers and their role in relation to these phenomena.

Unlike the structuralist theoreticians, human relation writers, who stress human motivation, do not see conflict as inevitable within organizations. They note that it occurs frequently but that sensitive and responsive management can prevent much of it and resolve the rest, primarily through creating an environment that promotes open communication and trust.

The contingency school of management, as a response to the scientific management theory, argues that there is no one best way or correct decision that will work for all situations. However, managers will make good, acceptable decisions if they have the sensitivity to make a valid assessment of the needs of a situation and have some decision making skills.

Participative management theory is based heavily on the application of the democratic process. It is better understood as an application of a manager's belief that human beings are more productive, more loyal, and are more trustworthy if they are granted a role in decision making in areas that affect them and their job. Participative management is believed to promote better consensus between individual goals and the goals of the organization.

Since good managers are taught, not born, and faculty involvement in the process of decision making for their programs is vital, the participative management theory (discussed above) constitutes the conceptual framework of the present study. According to the administrative management theorists, effective managers, who can apply the principles of administrative management, could be trained. Such preparation can be achieved through integrating new administrative and management courses into the ESL and applied linguistics master and doctoral programs. This integration will allow the graduates of such programs to be acquainted with the principles of effective management which in turn gives them the chance to be involved in the administration of their programs.

Summary

The present study focused on one aspect of ESL and applied linguistics graduate programs in preparing prospective teachers, researchers and administrators. Administrative training is the primary focus of this study. Management preparation is chosen to be the focus of the present study because according to the participative management theory management can be taught. In order to determine the desirability and necessity of integrating management courses into the ESL and applied linguistics programs, current ESL and applied linguistics program administrators were chosen to serve as the population of this study. Drawing upon their perceptions of the necessity for administrative training, appropriate answers will be provided to the posed research questions.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

In this chapter two types of literature will be reviewed. The first part discusses those studies that investigated the topic of ESL administration in different settings. The second part is devoted exclusively to studies which investigated the roles, competencies and characteristics of the division chairs, directors, and coordinators of academic programs at postsecondary institutions.

ESL Program Administration Studies

Interest in ESL program administration emerged in the 1980s. Before this time the literature in ESL is devoid of research on the administrative aspects of ESL programs. Later on, particularly in the mid 1980's, studies addressing this topic began to emerge. One main reason for this sudden appearance is the fact that the rapid growth of the field lead some universities to establish independent ESL and applied linguistics programs which were, before this time, embodied in other departments such as the English Department. Another reason for this emergence might have been the frustration that ESL and applied linguistics graduates faced when they were asked to administer an Intensive English Program (IEP), either a proprietary or a university program. A third reason, which is unique to foreign countries, is that the applied linguistics majors who graduate from American universities have not received any management and leadership courses which prepare them to be administrators as well as educators and scholars in their homelands. This becomes more clear if we know that the English departments in the foreign countries, where English is a second or a foreign language, are ESL/EFL divisions.

The main objective of such programs is to graduate qualified teachers who will teach the English language at the elementary, preparatory and secondary levels.

Therefore, studying the ESL program administrators becomes an essential inquiry if effective and efficient programs are to be established. Staczek and Carkin (1985, p. 294) offer the following definition of the ESL program:

> [An ESL] program is an administrative and academic enterprise with a comprehensive mission to provide ESL training, using qualified professionals in a logical and developing sequence of courses to guide the student to a level of mastery of the English language that will lead to eventual success in a degree or certificate program in an academic institution.

The first publication pertaining to ESL program administrators appeared in 1975 when the Bilingual Education Services Center in Arlington Heights, Illinois, published the *Handbook for the ESL/ABE Administrator* within the framework of Adult Basic Education (ABE). The three volumes of this handbook are considered the most detailed, comprehensive and usable set of guidelines for ESL program administration. But, none is based on empirical studies of ESL program administrators.

The first volume of this handbook outlines the roles and responsibilities of ESL program administrators. For instance it is stated that the director must at least be aware of and responsible for seeing that the program meets the needs of adult learners, the administrative organization impacts the success of the program, accurate fiscal records are developed, there is effective leadership for the program, there is continuous evaluation, opportunities for staff development are available, and that comprehensive student records are maintained (Escobar & Daugherty, 1975).

"[T]o help determine the qualities desirable in a College/Adult Level ESL/EFL Program Administrator and the qualifications appropriate for the position he [she] holds" (Cited by Mathies, 1983, p.17) Wilcox (1980) conducted a study on Colorado ESL program administrators. His main purpose was to draw some specific guidelines that would assist in the selection and preparation of ESL program administrators.

Wilcox reported that two sets of qualifications are needed for administrators. These include general qualifications and specialized qualifications. Under the specialized qualifications category, Wilcox reported that a program administrator should at least be acquainted with information on general educational administration, business management, personnel management and research design and computer applications in addition to his knowledge on ESL and applied linguistics subjects.

"The adequacy for job preparation and job satisfaction of M. A. TESOL graduates" was a study conducted by Ochsner (1980, p.199). Ochsner surveyed 196 graduates in TESOL to find out how useful the M. A. TESOL program had been in preparing them for their jobs. "[T]he graduates were generally inclined to rate favorably their M. A. training" (p.206). Two main exceptions to this generalization were: 1) the doctoral students rated their M. A. programs less favorably than their colleagues, particularly, pertaining to research skills; 2) both doctoral and master students rated their training as inadequate for publications (23% unprepared) and administrative work (49% unprepared).

This large percent (49%) of unprepared graduates for management and administration necessitates the development of such courses in the ESL and applied linguistics master and doctoral programs. This becomes more clear if we know that "one in four M.A. graduates becomes, less than three years after graduation, an ESL administrator" (Ochsner, 1980, p.206). The other participants in Ochsner's study 14% (very much prepared) and 37% (somewhat prepared) did not mention how they received their training. Is it through their programs? Is it through other programs? Is it through in-service training or via some other avenue? The present study is designed to help in finding adequate answers to the above questions.

Regardless of the way the administrator acquired his/her managerial skills, Johns (1981) conducted a study on ESL program administration in California to determine the impact of the program administrator on his staff and their performance. He focused primarily on the administrator's personality and his/her managerial skills. He concluded that instructors stay with the program and perform very well if the director involves his staff in the process of decision making, leadership and fairness, sets evaluation criteria and follows appropriate assessment procedures, proves knowledge and interest in the subject matter. This conclusion, although it is limited to California ESL instructors, indicates the importance of management and leadership courses and internships that train proficient, effective and knowledgeable ESL administrators. Moreover, this limited and informal study inspired conducting a study on a national level.

The National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA, 1981) undertook the responsibility for assessing the professional concerns of ESL teachers in an attempt to draw up comprehensive guidelines that would be general enough to encompass the variety of ESL programs. NAFSA's efforts produced useful discussions of the characteristics of the successful programs, but tended to focus on matters of curriculum and instruction. Pertaining to administrative issues, the statement focused mainly on work loads and benefits for instructors, course loads and tuition rates for students. Also it recommended that:

> The director should have advanced academic training in the
> teaching of English as a second language and have teaching
> and administrative experience... (NAFSA, 1981,
> Cited by Mathies, 1983, p.12-13).

The skills and job satisfaction of ESL program administrators was the subject of a study conducted in the Washington D.C. area. Among the conclusions of this study was that ESL program administrators who came from educational administration and communication viewed their background as very useful. That is, this background provided them with management skills such as human relations, business and budgetary skills, time management, organization, interviewing and communication. Moreover, the majority of the interviewees expressed a desire for more training in management, leadership and computer assistance in management issues (Wright, 1981).

The issues of needs assessment, evaluation, and accountability in ESL/EFL teachers in Japan was the subject of Richards and Nobuyuki (1983) study. To find out what sort of graduate training EFL teachers had received and to determine how relevant such previous training was perceived to be in the light of the current professional responsibilities of EFL teachers in Japan, forty one participants were surveyed. Thirty-four respondents held M. A. degrees from American universities, one from a British university, one from a Canadian university; two held American Ph.D.s, and two respondents had completed course work but had not yet graduated; one did not indicate.

Data analysis revealed that the six most studied subjects deal with language analysis and applied psycholinguistics (phonology, transformational grammar, structural linguistics, second language acquisition, and contrastive analysis). On the other hand, the least studied subject was administration (12%). The participants judged the value of their training in terms of its practical application and effectiveness. The correlation between courses studied and their usefulness in the field was only .367 ($P< .05$, Spearman's rank coefficient). This indicates that there is a necessity for an evaluation of the master and doctoral programs curricula in ESL and applied linguistics programs. In other words this study:

> suggests the need for more broadly based empirical studies of teacher ... needs as a basis for the development and validation of more relevant models of ESL/EFL teacher training. (Richards and Nobuyuki, 1983, p.322).

The training of University of Hawaii ESL program graduates was the subject of Day's (1984) study. One hundred and thirty seven graduates, during the 13-year period from 1967-1979, were surveyed. The initial positions after receiving M. A. degree and the current positions held by the participants were the focus of the study. Day concludes that:

> Of the 104 who responded to the question,[what were your primary duties?] 95 (91%) mentioned teaching... This is the same percentage reported... for the first post-M.A. The next most frequently mentioned duties, materials preparation (45%), curriculum design (41%), and administrate-ion (38%), are the same as those for the duties of the first post-M.A. job ...; however, there are increases in the percentage of duties that do not involve teaching, in particular, in administration, from 24% to 38%. (1984, p.115).

It seems that as ESL program graduates remain in the profession, they become more increasingly involved with activities other than teaching. This confirms Ochsner's (1980) statement that one out of four ESL teachers, becomes and administrator in less than three years. The implication of such results on higher education ESL and applied linguistics programs is the necessity to restructure their curricula in order to graduate teachers and administrators who are acquainted with technical, human, and conceptual skills that characterize the successful administration.

"The effective direction of others and accomplishment of objectives... rests on" the above mentioned three skills [technical, human, and conceptual] (Katz, 1974, p.24). Pennington (1984) offers a concise interpretation of Katz' (1974) administrative model as applied to the environment of ESL administration. The Technical skill is "an understanding of and a proficiency in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, or techniques" (Katz, 1974, p.24). It implies specialty in a specific field, the ability to analyze, synthesize, and criticize. For the ESL administrator, this means that he/she should be able to teach, evaluate, adapt, develop, design, test, place, hire, train, finance, manage, and report.

The human skill is "the ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team... [the administrator leads] (Katz, 1974, p.24). Such skill is manifested through the way the administrator perceives his/her superiors, equals, and subordinates, and through the way he/she behaves accordingly. For the ESL administrator this means that he/she should be aware of and sensitive to the needs of the staff, their concerns, and the constraints and the restraints operating upon them. He/she should have the ability to present, train, conduct meetings, give individual counsel and feedback, handle complaints and criticism, make changes, and keep morale high among the staff.

The conceptual skill "involves the ability to see the enterprise as a whole; it includes recognizing how the various functions of the organization depend on one another, and how changes in one part affect all the others" (Katz, 1974, p.26). The conceptual skill is the basis for all planning and decision making. On it depends the effective coordination of the various components of the organization, the whole future of the organization and the tone of the organization. For the ESL program administrator, he/she should be able to plan, set goals and priorities and be able to determine the best use of people's time and the resources (human and financial) of the program.

Thus, as an administrator (director or division chair), he/she should be equipped with the aforementioned three main skills. Since such skills are acquired through learning and practice and not inborn, the significance of designing management and leadership courses for ESL program administrators and other disciplines become a necessity. Such management courses also can be taken from other departments such as the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department in areas such as educational administration, and the Business and Public Administration Department in areas such as organization and personnel management, resource planning, and marketing and public relations. Having such courses might meet the managers needs for more training in administration.

The necessity of training in administration and curriculum evaluation is not only a requirement for ESL graduates, but also for other related graduate programs such as the bilingual education programs. Johnson (1985) conducted a study to obtain data on the professional status of graduates of bachelors, masters, and doctoral degree programs one to three years after the completion of training. Eight hundred and nine teacher graduates were surveyed by mail, and one hundred and sixty-eight trainer graduates were surveyed by telephone. She found that trainer graduates had obtained positions as educational administrators (34%), and the largest group of doctoral level trainers (31%) were employed as administrators. She found also that students completing doctoral teacher programs failed to secure positions as researchers or evaluators. She concluded that "... positions held by graduates and the responsibilities of those positions provide one source of information for evaluating the content of training programs" (p. 74).

The administrative styles of ESL administrators in colleges and universities was a subject of Reasor's (1986) study. The main objectives of his study "were to describe the background and training of ESL administrators and to evaluate their self-perceived dominant administrative styles" (1986, p. 338). An administrator's organizational behavior can be categorized into one of four basic dominant administrative styles. These administrative styles are:

> (a) *integrated*, which consists of behavior that is both task and peopleoriented; (b) *related*, which is people oriented with emphasis on interpersonal relations on the job; (c) *dedicated*, which is task-oriented and often called the authoritarian style; and (d) *separated*, which is rule and procedure oriented and known as the bureaucratic style. (Reasor, 1986, p. 340).

In particular, Reasor intended to identify which one of the above terms describe the ESL administrative behavior. He concluded that:

> The ESL administrators clustered heavily (69%) around the separated style... 62% of the administrators... perceived themselves to be ineffective in their present styles. (1986, p.341).

The conclusion that a considerable percentage of ESL administrators viewed themselves as ineffective is one of the concerns of this research. This study is designed to find the reasons behind such attitudes. That is, Reasor's conclusion inspired to investigate the main factors that lead to this ineffectiveness and bureaucratic type of style of ESL administrators.

Staczek (1991) in an article entitled "*Professional Development and Program Administration*" contends persuasively:

> that professionals consider what opportunities the intensive English program (IEP) and our graduate programs in applied linguistics offer for the professional development of graduate students in training and faculty with regard to innovation, creativity and satisfaction for faculty, students and administrators. (p. 21)

Drawing on fifteen years of experience in second language education and university program administration, Staczek (1991, p. 21) argues that "[a]cademic departments and programs are administered by teachers or teacher-scholars who have not been schooled in management practices." He continues that as second language teacher educators,

> we have received the intellectual training characteristic of our disciplines, but not the training necessary to make decisions affecting programs, financial resources, and people... Our teacher training programs and programs in applied linguistics have done little to initiate our apprentices into the culture in which they are asked to perform. We have imparted very little about budgetary processes, curricular planning, faculty recruitment development, evaluation, and retention, and academic governance procedures. (1991, p. 21-22, 27).

In brief Staczek argues for preparing not only faculties who have learned to conduct research and present it to students and their colleagues, but also for preparing leaders and managers. That is, our ESL programs must graduate professionals who will be ready to chair a department when their turn comes or when they are appointed to do so. A chair who "is an ombudsman, a recruiter, a fiscal manager, a cheerleader, a politician, a professional teacher and scholar, and a glorified office manager" as Rosbottom (1987, p. 3) states.

Studies of Other Academic Departments' Administrators

The role of the department chairpersons in American higher education institutions has changed significantly since the establishment of the first college department at Harvard University in the last century. The decentralization of decision-making authority in American institutions and the increasing influence of faculty members in the formulation of institutional policy have lead to a new arrangement of the academic power structure. The department and departmental heads became prominent powers in academic governance. Francis (1962, p. 58-59) states that:

> Regardless of whether the institution is one "college" or has a multiplicity of colleges and schools, the basic academic component is the academic department. With the increasing specialization of knowledge the faculty member has come more and more to identify himself with professional discipline, and hence with the academic department in which he is located.With the growth in size of institutions the number of faculty has increased so substantially, and departmental budgets have become so large (especially in departments with heavy research commitments), that enormous power resides in the departments, and, consequently, inthe department heads.

Thus, the chairmanship of an academic department is a critical leadership position in higher education institutions. The chairman as an individual has administrative responsibilities which he/she must implement as the leader of his/her unit. As a scholar he/she is the agent of the faculty members comprising his/her department. Consequently, department chairmen were the subjects of several studies. These studies focused on the roles and functions of department chairmen as viewed by students, faculty, chairpersons, and deans. It was felt that knowledge of these perceptions would contribute to decisions about the selection and training of department chairmen and shed some light on the organization of academic departments, and the power vested in department chairmen.

The power imputed to departmental chairmen by professors in five state-supported four-year colleges and its relationship to the satisfaction and productivity of departmental faculty was investigated by Hill & Wendel (1967). Seven hundred and twenty-one questionnaires were mailed to professors in 65 departments representing five classifications of academic fields. Four hundred and five questionnaires were returned of which only three hundred and seventy-five were usable.

In particular, Hill and Wendel (1967) attempted to test four hypotheses. The first hypothesis states that:

> professors view the authority system of their colleges as relatively "flat" hierarchies, in which the professors have considerable power as compared with the administrative groups of departmental chairmen, deans, higher administrators and boards of trustees. (p. 550)

The second hypothesis states that "[t]here is an inverse relationship between the power of the departmental chairmen and the satisfaction of the departmental faculty" (p. 550). The third hypothesis states that "[t]here is a direct relationship between the power of the departmental chairmen and the professional output of the departmental faculty" (p. 551). The last hypothesis states that "[t]here is a direct relationship between the power of the departmental chairmen and the perceived productivity of departmental faculty" (p. 552).

Pertaining to the first hypothesis, Hill and Wendel concluded that although hierarchy of authority does exist, it is quite flat. Professors perceived departmental chairmen as having less impact than the deans, higher administrators and the board of trustees and even less than the professors themselves. Moreover, the professors wield almost as much control as the control to which they are subject, and only department chairmen are subject to considerably more passive control (the amount of influence to which they are subject from all levels) than the active control (the amount of influence they have over all other levels) they exercise.

When Hill and Wendel computed the active and passive control measures for the chairmen, they found that the chairmen have the greatest amount of influence over their own activities, and only a little less over professors. The lower position of the division chair seems to be a result of their lack of influence over higher administration groups. The passive control curve indicates that they are subject to more control by the professors than they exert, but are pressured to an even greater extent by the higher and middle administrators. On the basis of these results, one might argue that departmental chairmen are "men in the middle" caught between two groups, both of which probably make heavy demands upon the chairmen and expect them to serve their unique needs. That is, higher administrators are seen as directing and controlling the chairmen in carrying out the policy of the colleges, at the same time the professors are attempting to influence them.

With regard to the other three of the four hypotheses, Hill and Wendel concluded that the higher the power imputed to a chairman, the higher the satisfaction of the professors. The more power the faculty members impute to the chairman, the less productive they have been in their academic fields. In testing the last hypothesis, Hill and Wendel found that the greater the power of the chairman, the more productive its department faculty perceived themselves to be in terms of attaining organizational goals.

The Internal Organization of Academic Departments was the topic of Ryan's (1972) study. He attempted to identify and classify departmental variations in formal organizations for decision making and to relate these differences to patterns of informal organizations. Fifteen academic departments were chosen, at Ohio State University, for the study. These departments were selected to represent the social sciences, humanities, physical sciences, biological sciences, and the business and education professional schools. Ryan (1972, p. 481) stated that:

> departments were classified as having headship or collegial organizations. The headships could be further differentiated into those departments in which decisions were made by the chairman alone (dictatorships) and those in which his decisions were influenced by a cohesive and select power group of faculty members (oligarchies).

Another major finding of this study was that department size did not promote oligarchy. Instead, oligarchy was determined by the degree to which faculty members would have an opportunity to influence major departmental decisions. In small departments where the department chairmen reserved the right to make final decisions they were made vulnerable to the informal influence of departmental oligarches. Thus, Ryan (1972) contended that full faculty participation is dependent to some extent upon the visibility of decision-making structures, and suffers when administrators are given the right to "speak for their men".

The functions of department chairmen can be categorized into three classifications. These include professional activities (productive scholar, achieves program goals, good teacher), administrative responsibilities (in faculty government, sound assessment of faculty, administration of department tasks, guides curriculum development, represents department well within the university), and personal characteristics (sensitive to department needs, makes strong impression, decision maker with faculty and advisors, good conflict resolution, decisive thinking and action).

Siever, Ross, & Charles (1972) studied the functions and responsibilities of department chairmen at two land grant universities as perceived by the faculty members and the deans (N=481). There was a strong agreement between the two universities' faculty and deans on the administrative responsibilities of department chairmen. The results of the study revealed that administration of department tasks, guiding curriculum development, being a proficient negotiator, sound assessment of faculty, communicating administration were the most important administrative functions that the department chairmen should be able to perform.

Usually, the above mentioned activities are ignored or very little attention is paid to them. Chairmen are usually trained to teach and to do research. Nevertheless, the program and department administrators are evaluated on the basis of such functions and administrative activities, not on their teaching and research skills. The success or failure of the department depends upon the administrative responsibilities as well as the teaching and research efforts of the department director. Roach (1976, p. 14) states that:

> ...to a very large degree, what the chair-person does or fails to do concerning the departmental programs, determines the success or lack of success of the department. Certainly, its success is his [or her] responsibility.

Researchers have linked department outcomes (student learning gains, student satisfaction, quality of student dissertations, graduate school admissions ratio, faculty research and publication output, faculty satisfaction) with a wide range of predictors. Among these predictors are the faculty collegiality, decision making process, and the chairperson leadership. Bare (1980) examined the department goal setting and planning, decision making and influence processes, personal program evaluation methods, and chairperson leadership behavior on departments' performances. He found that there is an attested correlation between the chairperson effectiveness and research quality. His conclusion contradicts Hill's and Wendel (1967) finding that the more power the departmental chairperson has the less productive the faculty are in terms of their professional output. However, he expressed a need for better leadership studies of administrators in general and departmental chairpersons in particular. He recommended that future studies of departmental performance should measure chairperson performance in terms of counseling and team building, coordination and control, staffing, formalizing, training, external representation, and performance reward-management.

Therefore, the concept that all department chairmen have common functions and need a common set of administrative skills to successfully accomplish those functions, forms the premise of Jennerich's (1981) study. One of his objectives was to shed some light on the issue of chairperson competencies as viewed by the chairpersons themselves. Three hundred department chairmen, in four-year colleges and universities across the United States, were asked, in the second part of the questionnaire, to rank fourteen competencies identified as necessary for effective chairpersons.

The order of the competencies, as ranked by the participants according to their significance was character/integrity, leadership ability, interpersonal skills, ability to communicate effectively, decision making ability, organizational ability, planning skills, professional competence, problem solving ability, evaluating faculty, program/course innovation and development, budgetary skills, ability to recruit new faculty, and fund raising ability.

It is obvious that department chairs themselves agreed that a chairman should have certain managerial competencies as well as personal and interpersonal competencies. As Jennerich (1981, p.54) puts it:

> regardless of institutional setting, academic discipline, or other variables, there is indeed a common set of competencies that *all* chairmen view as important and necessary.

Some of these competencies are personal and do not demand training such as character/integrity and leadership ability. On the other hand the remaining competencies require training and instruction. Thus, there is a necessity for the development of managerial and administrative courses and practicums if effective managers are targeted.

Bennett (1990), drawing on his experience as a dean, identifies five strategies for collaboration between the dean and the departmental chair. These strategies are related to the areas of development, communication, motivation, budget, and evaluation. Pertaining to the professional development of the department chairs and deans, Bennett (1990, p. 25) contends that "[f]ar more often than deans, chairs assume their office with little preparation". In the words of Gmelch (1991, p. 45):

> They [chairpersons] come to the position without leadership training; without prior administrative experience; with-out a clear understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of their role; without recognition of metamorphic changes that occur as one "transforms" from a professor to a chair; and without an awareness of the cost to their academic careers and personal lives.

What price does an untrained and unaware division chair pay for academic leadership? What surprises and sacrifices are embedded in the department chair position?

To answer these questions, the University Council for Educational Administration Center for the Study of the Department Chair conducted a comprehensive survey of department chairs at 101 research and doctorate-granting universities across the United States. Eight department chairs were selected from each institution and were stratified by eight discipline classifications resulting in a sample of 808 chairs.

One of the prices professors pay when they accept a chairmanship is time. The new chair must be able to manage his time spent on teaching, conducting research, and engaging in family and leisure activities. Unable to do so they will end up "spending 88 percent, 82 percent, 78 percent less time in these activities [research and writing, keeping current in their discipline, and teaching] respectively" (Gmelch, 1991, p. 46).

Another price professors pay when they assume the chairmanship position is dealing with stress. In Gmelch's (1991) study, chairs indicated that they suffer serious stress from the managerial tensions of program approval, complying with rules and regulations, completing paperwork on time, resolving collegial differences, and making decisions that affect other lives. In an investigation of the role conflict in academic organizations, particularly among department chairpersons, it was found that "individuals in professional organizations who are 'caught in the middle' between conflicting expectations have been shown to frequently experience stress" (Carol 1974: 54). "[W]hen the expectations are not clear, that is, when individuals do not know what is expected of them or how their work is evaluated by their administrative superiors and others" (Newell, 1978, p. 156), they experience role ambiguity that can be stressful.

However, when they [division chairs] were asked about their orientation, "60 percent identified themselves as faculty and 23 percent as administrators" (Gmelch, 1991, p. 47). How ESL and applied linguistics directors/division chairs perceive themselves is one of the main concerns of the present study. Moreover, 65 percent of chairs return to faculty status after serving as a chair and only 19 percent continued in higher education administration (Gmelch, 1991).

Several reasons are identified in the literature for chairmen resignation and returning to full-time teaching. Among these reasons is the lack of administrative skills. College faculty are educated as teachers and scholars with a strong commitment to their disciplines. Thus, department chairmen often experienced role conflict. They found the administrative task of their positions out of harmony and incompatible with their basic values, self concept, and academic commitments (John, 1966, Cited by Heimler, 1967).

How can institutional leaders reduce the imbalance caused by time, stress, and attract and retain effective leaders? By training department chairs for their leadership experience, providing them with ample support, helping them to maintain their research interest, institutional leaders can make the department chair position more attractive to faculty leaders.

Related Literature

Participative management theory has been chosen to serve as the theoretical framework for the present study because most of the ESL and applied linguistics graduate programs are administered by more than one person. Another reason is that, where the program is administered by one person, all faculty members in the program must be involved in the process of decision making where these decisions affect them and their program. A third reason is that participative management appears to be a style of management that releases the potential of employees both to grow and to make positive contributions to their organizations. The fourth reason, according to Alexander (1981), is that participative management theory has been found to have a favorable effect on employee attitudes and commitment. There are some studies that have been conducted on the impact of participative management on the satisfaction and productivity of faculty members, conflict resolution and problem solving, stress reduction, ethics, values and mental health of the departments and the organization as a whole.

Scanlan and Roger (1981, Cited by Cangemi, 1985, p. 4) define participative management:

> as a way to get things accomplished by creating an environment whereby employees are encouraged to become involved both mentally and emotionally in problem-solving situations which will contribute to organizational objectives and goals.

Employees will strive to help in achieving the department's goals and the mission of the institution as a whole if they are perceived as capable, can handle responsibility, are creative, are concerned with growth, are trustworthy, are able to think, and are genuine assets to their institution. If participative management is to work effectively managers must embrace the above perspective.

For managers in higher education institutions, particularly division chairs and directors, it is not enough to embrace the above perspective; they must be educated individuals with a fundamental understanding of the broad divisions of knowledge, and individuals who have certain technical, social, and leadership skills in order to guide the intellectuals of their departments (Gibson, 1969). Because such individuals are rare in the arena of higher education institutions, many critics have charged that many colleges and universities are among the worst managed institutions in the United states. They argue that most colleges and universities are run by strangers to their faculties. Kowalski and Bryson (1985, p. 124) argue the reason behind this is that "universities have studied everything from government to Persian mirrors, but few have ever studied deeply their own administrative practices".

A thorough study and practice of participative management techniques and allowing faculty and staff participation in the process of decision making would yield many benefits to the institution. Among these benefits are: increased supervisor effectiveness, faculty satisfaction, decreased student alienation, improved student achievement, ability to reduce organization complexity by synthesizing the contributions of individuals with various organizational perspectives, acceptance of the decision by all parties to the decision, providing faculty and staff with some element of control over their fates (Pollay, Taylor, and Thompson, 1976).

An important factor in the philosophy of participative management is the role and function of the director or chairperson at the department level; the amount of authority should be commensurate with the responsibility. Kowalski and Bryson (1985) argue that the department director or chairperson bears a great responsibility at most institutions. This is evidenced by the responsibility and authority assigned to budget development and expenditure, hiring and supervision of faculty, evaluation process of faculty, decisions in merit allocation at the department level, responsibility for curriculum, and numerous other functions.

At the college or university level, participatory management can and does work if properly nurtured by top administrators in a collegial environment. Kowalski and Bryson (1985) list many objective and subjective goals achieved by adhering to participatory management techniques at a college committed to this management theory. Objective goals entail: college accreditation, re-accreditation of various programs, steady growth in enrollment, greater community acceptance and support, and cooperative and positive efforts in response to state-mandated budget cuts. Examples of subjective results are: employee stability and very low turnover, no efforts by faculty to become unionized, greater eagerness by individuals to participate on college committees, enhanced departmental cohesion and positive and healthy atmosphere.

Having a wholesome environment can substantially reduce stress in the work place. An institution structure which actively solicits faculty and staff input and encourages them to be involved in discussions of issues and concerns fosters a healthy working environment in which employees experience relatively little stress. On the other hand, "nonparticipation of managers in the decision making process... is the most significant factor in producing job related stress" (Margolis, Kross, and Quinn, 1974). Nonparticipation is significantly related to a wide range of debilitating results such as lowered self-esteem, reduced job satisfaction, and decreased productivity.

The need for productive faculty and staff who are working effectively to accomplish the mission and the goals of their institution is a definite requirement for the successful operation of any institution. The principles of humanistic/participative management, if applied with sincerity and without reservation, will allow institutions to enhance its competitive position through improved utilization of its human resources. The achievement of this goal in an institution is dependent upon adoption of humanistic principles and formation of an institution philosophy which has the necessary participative content and sincerity. An attempt to disguise a program of this nature will not only lead to failure, but will establish distrust which will result in self-destruction.

Satisfaction (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth) is another individual need that is accomplished through participative management. Maslow (1970) regards satisfaction of human needs as the key factors in human behavior. Among these needs are acceptance/belongingness (the need to be recognized and accepted as a group member by one's peers) and self-actualization (the need for self-fulfillment, personal growth and development, and worthwhile accomplishments). Such needs can not be satisfied if the climate of the institution does not provide its faculty and staff with the opportunity to participate in the process of decision making.

Participation in the process of decision making not only satisfies faculty and staff, but also impacts their motivation. The relationship between participation and motivation depends on people needs for control, competence, achievement, self-fulfillment, and personal growth. It is these needs that are satisfied by participation. Participative management process makes it possible for employees to obtain rewards that satisfy these needs.

The relationship between participation and motivation becomes more clear when people participate in setting goals and commit themselves to achieving these goals. According to Locke & Latham (1984) when people participate in setting goals and get information about their performance two things happen. First, they set goals that are perceived by them to be achievable. Second, their sense of self-esteem and competence becomes tied to achieving their goals and therefore they are highly motivated to achieve them. In brief, participation in goal setting can have a significant impact on motivation.

In addition to the positive impact of participation on economic variables such as production and productivity and sociological and psychological variables such as satisfaction, morale, attitude, and motivation, this management theory can be viewed as a method of conflict prevention or a conflict solving method. If faculty and staff are active in the process of decision making, it is logical to assume that they will feel more responsible than those who are only given orders. Their identification with the decision and eventually with their work will be greater. They will not feel merely hired to teach and conduct research, but they will feel like members of a social community called an institution. Obradovic (1985, p. 61) in differentiating between participative management and collective bargaining pertaining to conflict resolution states that

> participation and w.s.m. [worker-self management] are conflict preventing and c.b. [collective bargaining] is conflict solving.

If we regard participation and its more complete form, self-management, as problem solving in a decision-making system, then it will be logical to assume that there will be less conflict in the institutions where participative management theory exists.

If participative management theory is to be effective in conflict resolution and prevention, faculty and staff must be aware of many problems and exceptions associated with participative management. For instance, in every organization there is a difference between intentions and reality. According to Obradovic (1978)) participation is effective only if there is a real chance for it to be carried out. If there is a big gap between intentions and reality, it can happen that not only will the system not work, but also it negatively impacts the expectations and aspirations of the faculty and staff of the institution. Workers lose interest in the activity and finally resign.

On the contrary, if participation is properly carried out, identification with the organization and one's job is more intense. Workers are more productive and more satisfied. In cases of conflict or a strike in an institution where participative management theory is implemented, it can be useful in conflict solving. Thus we might say that, although participative management is primarily conflict preventive, it can be effective in problem solving. In many organizations that promote participative management there is a firm belief that if participation is introduced into the organization, one can expect harmony between its constituencies and employees. As Lawer (1986, p. 37) puts it:

> One of the most important payoffs from allowing people to control their work and function in self-managing work teams is improved communication and coordination. Similarly, in problem solving groups such as quality circles, people learn how other jobs are done and how to coordinate efforts to work together better.

In brief, participative management is a radical and ambitious model requiring major social change. It is primarily aimed at problem prevention not the ending of conflict. Because even with participative model, conflicts are present and occur openly from time to time. The best solution to prevent and handle conflict is to have both participative management and collective bargaining (Obradovic, 1985, p.63). In this case there will be less conflict and when it does appears it will be handled efficiently.

Summary

Both types of the literature reviewed in this chapter indicate that there is an indispensable need for managerial training for prospective coordinators, directors and division chairs. The studies conducted on ESL and applied linguistics programs, in particular, revealed that such programs did not offer management courses in their programs. Moreover, they concluded that among the primary duties of the graduates of these programs is program administration. The present study is designed to investigate how well such graduates perform their managerial tasks. Do they desire administrative training? Do they recommend designing management and leadership courses for prospective ESL and applied linguistics program administrators?

Chapter 3

Methodology

The primary objective of the present study was to provide empirical data pertaining to ESL program administration at the graduate university level. Such data was expected to help in determining whether it is desirable to include management and leadership courses in the graduate programs of ESL and applied linguistics. Furthermore, the gathered data constituted the basis for determining whether the training of ESL and applied linguistics graduates in general, and in research and publication in particular, is appropriate or not. A thorough discussion of the methods of data collection, instrument of data collection, and methods of data analysis are presented in the following sections.

Methods of Data Collection

The subjects of this study were the current ESL program administrators and coordinators at American universities that award the Master and Doctoral degrees in ESL and Applied Linguistics. Two methods were utilized in collecting the data for the present study. First, a questionnaire was mailed to the current ESL program administrators at the American universities that award the master and/or the doctorate degree in ESL or applied linguistics. Their addresses were obtained from the *1992-94 Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the United States.* Second a brief article was published in the *TESOL Matters* urging current and former directors of ESL and applied linguistics graduate programs to participate in the study (see Appendix B).

Instrument of Data Collection

It was the intention of the researcher to collect data from every member of the population targeted. The total number of the target population was 178 participants. Thirty three were administrators of programs that award the doctoral degree and one hundred and seventy-eight were from programs that award the master's degree. The directors of the doctoral programs also administered the master's programs at their institutions. This left us with only 145 participants. Moreover, there are two institutions who offered more than one master's degree, with different emphasis, in the same program under the same advisor. This left us with 143 participants.

In order to survey the whole population, a questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire is composed of four main sections (see Appendix C), including background information, academic training, administrative training, and an open-ended question section.

The first part of the questionnaire collected demographic data about the current ESL and applied linguistics program administrators. Seven nominal variables are identified in this section. These variables are: (1) place of the program within the institution, (2) title of the person in charge, (3) number of the faculty members in the department (department size), (4) the length of time the respondent has served as an administrator, (5) the role of the person in charge, (6) provision of management and leadership courses and (7) requirement of such courses.

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to collect general information about the academic training of the current ESL and applied linguistics program administrators. Six nominal variables are included in this section. These variables are: (1) the highest degree earned, (2) critical thinking skill, (3) teaching, (4) research, (5) publication and (6) preparation for academic responsibilities in general.

The third part of the questionnaire was designed to gather information about the administrative training of the current ESL and applied linguistics programs administrators. Ten nominal variables are specified in this section as well as one open-ended question. The nominal variables are (1) curriculum design, (2) budget development, (3) evaluation skills, (4) recruiting and retaining skills, (5) planning and setting goals, (6) availability of administrative courses in the program from which the administrator graduated, (7) significance of administrative training, (8) effectiveness of the administrator, (9) methods of acquiring administrative skills after graduation and (10) preparation for administrative responsibilities in general.

The last part of the questionnaire consisted of four open-ended questions. The first question requests the participants to identify the types of problems an ESL or an applied linguistics program administrator faces. The second question is concerned with the elements such as new courses and internships that might be included in ESL graduate programs in order to improve the preparation for administrative responsibilities. The third question requests that the participants provide any information which might be significant pertaining to the organizational placement of ESL program in the academic structure of institutions. The fourth question relates to any comments that the participants might have on any item in the questionnaire or other relevant points that are significant for ESL program administration.

Questionnaire Format

The instrument of data collection was designed so that the respondent could provide an answer merely by circling a letter. In an effort to offset the drawback of such formats (some significant information might be lost), five open-ended questions were provided in the questionnaire. Such questions were added in order to give the participants a chance to provide some information that might not be included in the answers provided for the items in the instrument. The format of the questionnaire was chosen to reduce the response period in filling out the questionnaire and to facilitate the keypunching of the data into computer files for statistical analysis.

Pilot Study

In an effort to obtain information on the appropriateness and context of the questionnaire items and to find out how the participants would fill out the survey, a pilot study was conducted. On January 21, 1993 a cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire, and a stamped, self-addressed envelop were sent to three ESL program administrators. Two of these directors are advisors of programs leading to the Ph.D. degree and the other one is a director of a program leading to the Master degree. All of them were contacted previously and agreed to participate in the pilot study.

Within a week the three pilot questionnaires had been returned. Two of them were completely filled out with a number of comments. The third questionnaire was not filled out because the participant thought that she had been asked only to review the questionnaire for further comments. Her comment was "... this is very well done. I have only made a couple of superficial notations." After analyzing the responses of the participants in the pilot study, it was decided that the basic format of the original questionnaire should be retained because it had proven easy for the respondents to use.

Collection of Data

The questionnaire mailing was conducted in a two-month period. On February 8, 1993 questionnaires were sent to 143 ESL and applied linguistics program administrators (the participant in the pilot study who did not fill out the questionnaire was sent a copy in order to fill it out). On February 16, the first follow-up letter was sent to all the participants. The purpose of this letter was to thank those who already completed the questionnaire and mailed it back and to urge those who did not, to fill it out and mail their questionnaire back as soon as possible (see Appendix B). Three weeks later 73 had been returned. On March 1st, the second follow-up (a new cover letter and a copy of the questionnaire) was sent to the 70 participants that had not initially responded. The survey was completed on April 1, 1993. A total of 100 responses had been received which constitutes 69.9% of the population surveyed.

Methods of Data Analysis

The type of data which has been collected takes both quantitative and qualitative forms. The process of categorizing and sorting, a technique of the grounded theory qualitative method, was used in analyzing the qualitative part of the data. Data obtained through the first three parts of the questionnaire were analyzed utilizing the statistical package SAS. The subjects' responses were converted to codes and numbers to facilitate the keypunching of the data into computer files. The frequencies, percentages, and where appropriate, means and standard deviations of the participants responses comprised the statistics analyzed by the quantitative method of this study.

I. Chi Square was utilized to test the independence of the following nominal and categorical variables from each other:

A. Is the place of the program in the organizational structure of the institution independent of or dependent on the size of the program?

B. Is the role of the program administrator independent of or dependent on the size of the program?

C. Is the effectiveness of the program administrator independent of or dependent on his/her previous managerial training?

D. Is the effectiveness of the program administrator independent or dependent on the length of the time the respondent has served as an administrator?

E. Are the problems identified by the administrator independent of or dependent on his/her previous managerial training?

F. Are the problems identified by the administrator independent of or dependent on the length of time the respondent has served as an administrator?

G. Is the current directors' level of satisfaction independent of or dependent on their perceived level of success of M.A. and doctoral ESL and applied linguistics programs, pertaining to preparing them to administrative responsibilities.

II. Rank Analysis Kruskal Wallis H-Test:

The purpose of this analysis was dual. First, to see if there was any difference between the ranking of the duties by those who describe themselves as administrators/primarily administrators and those who describe themselves as instructors/primarily instructors. Second, to show that all those who describe themselves as instructors/ primarily instructors performed administrative responsibilities.

Summary

The present study utilized a mailed questionnaire as its primary data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire is composed of four main sections. These are: background information, academic training, administrative training, and the comments section which has four open-ended questions. The contents of the questionnaire were based on the literature reported on ESL program managers and department chairpersons in general. Of the questionnaires, 69.9% were returned. The responses are analyzed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter is divided into seven main sections. In the first section, the kinds of administrative training offered by the master and doctoral ESL and applied linguistics programs to their graduate students are discussed. First, results are presented pertaining to administrative training, if offered, by the programs from which the current directors graduated. Then, the types and methods of management training, if any, provided by the programs that the current directors supervise are reported.

The second section also presents the results of two analyses. First, the responsibilities of an ESL or applied linguistics program director pertaining to the administrative aspects of the program are described. Second the ranking of these duties, by those who describe themselves as administrators/primarily administrators or instructors/primarily instructors were analyzed with the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test. The perceived appropriateness of graduate training for the current administrative responsibilities are reported in this section. That is, the adequacy of the administrative training components, if any, provided by the programs from which the current directors graduated are described in the second section also.

The problems that the current directors or coordinators encounter while performing their administrative duties are reported in the third section. The relationship between such problems that the directors face, on the one hand, and their previous managerial training and length of time they have served as directors, on the other hand, are also discussed in the third section.

The level of satisfaction that current ESL and applied linguistics program directors/coordinators have with their graduate academic and administrative training is documented in the fourth section also. The relationship between the current directors' level of satisfaction and the perceived level of effectiveness of graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs in preparing them for their academic and administrative duties will be recorded in the fourth section as well.

The fifth section is concerned with the elements such as new courses and internships that might be included in graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs in order to improve preparation of future administrators for their administrative duties. That is, the elements that the participants recommended to be integrated in the graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs syllabi are identified and discussed. Places and sizes of ESL and Applied linguistics programs will be documented in the sixth and seventh sections respectively.

Administrative Training

In Part III of the questionnaire, question 13 (see Appendix C), the participants were asked to indicate whether or not the program from which they received their graduate degree provided administrative training, and if so, what kind of training was provided. The respondents were then asked how well their programs prepared them for administrative duties (question 12), and if the avenues through which they sought administrative training in cases where they were not prepared by their graduate programs to assume administrative positions (question 14), and the type of managerial training their current programs, which they supervise, offer to their graduate students (questions 7&8).

Pertaining to the programs from which the current directors graduated, as Table 1 shows, data analysis reveals that 74.0% of the programs did not offer any kind of management and leadership training, 13.0% offered administrative training in their curriculum, 3.0% required students to pursue administrative training through other programs, and 6% encouraged the students to take administrative courses through other programs.

Table 1

Administrative Training Offered by Programs from which the Current Directors Graduated

Program	N	Percentage
Offered management courses in its curriculum	13	13
Required management courses through other programs	03	03
Encouraged taking management courses through other programs	06	06
Did not offer at all	74	74
Did not specify	04	04

N= 100

In question 15, they (the current directors) were asked to describe their preparation for administrative duties, overall. As Table 2 reveals 8%, 30%, 28%, and 30% were prepared very well, fairly well, poorly, and not at all, respectively, for assuming their managerial duties.

Table 2

Preparation for Administrative Duties

Preparation	N	Percentage
Very well prepared	08	08
Fairly well prepared	30	30
Poorly prepared	28	28
Not at all prepared	30	30
Did not specify	04	04

N= 100

Those directors/coordinators who were fairly, poorly, and not at all prepared for their administrative responsibilities (n=88) sought several avenues for acquiring or improving their administrative skills. Data analysis reveals that a large number (n=43) of these 88 directors acquired managerial training through practice and experience (48.9%), 32 through asking help from a colleague (36.4%), 11 through in-service training (12.5%), and two who enrolled in management courses after graduation (2.2%).

As a result of this situation some of the current directors integrated or are in the process of integrating some elements of administrative training into their programs to provide prospective administrators with the necessary managerial skills. Data analysis shows that 80% of the current ESL and applied linguistics programs do not provide their clients with administrative training, 15% provide their graduates with such training, and 5% are in the process of developing administrative training elements in their curricula (question number 7).

Of the fifteen programs which offer administrative training to their students, six (40.0%) require them to take such courses from their programs and nine (60.0%) require their students to take such courses from other programs (question number 8). Pertaining to the importance of including leadership and management elements in ESL and applied linguistics programs, analysis of the responses to question number 16 in the survey, reveals that 17%, 25%, 37%, and 21% reported that it is very important, important, somewhat important, or not important, respectively, to include administrative elements in the ESL and applied linguistics programs curricula (see Table 3).

Table 3

Significance of Including Administrative Training in
Graduate ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs

Importance	N	Percentage
Very Important	17	17
Important	25	25
Somewhat Important	37	37
Not Important	21	21

N= 100

Administrative Responsibilities of Graduate ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs' Directors

In Part III of the questionnaire (question number 12), the participants were asked to describe how well they had been prepared for their administrative duties. As Table 4 illustrates 34%, 45%, 11%, and 10% are very well prepared, fairly prepared, poorly prepared, or not at all prepared, respectively, for curriculum design. For developing a budget 5%, 17%, 27%, and 51% are very well prepared, fairly well prepared, poorly prepared, or not at all prepared, respectively. For evaluating an ESL or an applied linguistics program faculty 20% are very well prepared, 37% fairly well prepared, 14% poorly prepared, and 29% not at all prepared. For recruiting and retaining staff and students, 14%, 24%, 15%, 45% are very well prepared, fairly well prepared, poorly prepared, or not at all prepared, respectively. For planning and setting goals for an ESL or applied linguistics program, 29%, 32%, 14%, 25% are very well prepared, fairly well prepared, poorly prepared, or not at all prepared, respectively.

Table 4

Preparation for Administrative Responsibilities

Duty	Very well prepared	Fairly well prepared	Poorly prepared	Not at all prepared
A. Curriculum design	34%	45%	11%	10%
B. Developing a budget	05%	17%	27%	51%
C. Evaluating a ESL program and its staff	20%	37%	14%	29%
D. Recruiting and retaining staff and students.	14%	24%	15%	45%
E. Planning and setting goals for a ESL program.	29%	32%	14%	25%

Advising students, materials preparation, curriculum design, and other (research as specified by the participants) as some of the duties that program directors perform, were ranked by the participants in question number six according to their priorities. The Kruskal-Wallis H-Test (a non-parametric test of significance less restrictive than

ANOVA), requires only ordinal level (ranked data) rather than interval data, and no assumptions about the shape of the populations are required (Mason and Lind, 1990). In order to see if there is any difference between the self-identified administrators/primarily administrators versus instructors/ primarily instructors as reported in question 5, rankings of curriculum design, materials preparation, advising students, as examples of administrative duties, and research, were analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test (Analysis of Variance by Ranks). The results of the analysis are presented in Tables five, six, seven, and eight.

Table 5
NPAR1WAY PROCEDURE
for Student Advising Duty
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE
Classified by Variable ROLE

Role	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	St Dev Under H0	Mean Score
I/IA*	68	3575.0	3434.0	119.90	52.57
A/AI*	32	1475.0	1616.0	119.90	46.09

-Wilcoxon 2-Sample Test (Normal Approximation)
S= 1475 Z= - 1.17178 Prob > /Z/= 0.2413
T-Test approximation significance = 0.2441
-Kruskal-Wallis Test (Chi-Square Approximation)
-CHISQ= 0.55747 DF= 1 Prob. > CHISQ= 0.4553

*I (Instructor), IA (Instructor with administrative duties)
A (Administrator) AI (Administrator with instructional duties).

Table 6
NPAR1WAY PROCEDURE
for Materials Preparation Duty
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE
Classified by Variable ROLE

Role	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
I/IA	66	3361.0	3267.0	125.897	50.92
A/AI	32	1490.0	1584.0	125.897	46.56

-Wilcoxon 2-Sample Test (Normal Approximation)
S= 1490.00 Z= - .742669 Prob /Z/ = 0.4577
T-Test approximation significance = 0.4595
-Kruskal-Wallis Test (Chi-Square Approximation)
CHISQ= 0.55747 DF= 1 Prob > CHISQ= 0.4553

Table 7
NPAR1WAY PROCEDURE
for Curriculum Design Duty
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sum) for variable SCORE
Classified by variable ROLE

Role	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
I/IA	68	3534.0	3519.0	121.137	51.217
A/AI	32	1617.0	1632.0	121.147	50.531

-Wilcoxon 2-Sample Test (Normal Approximation)
S= 1617.0 Z= -.119699 Prob /Z/= 0.9047
T-Test approximation significance = 0.9050
-Kruskal-Wallis Test (Chi-Square Approximation)
CHISQ= 0.01533 DF= 1 Prob > CHISQ= 0.9015

Table 8
NPRA1WAY PROCEDURE
for Other (Research) Duty
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable SCORE
Classified by Variable ROLE

Role	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std dev Under H0	Mean Score
I/IA	67	3500.500	3350.0	119.72	52.246
A/AI	32	1449	1600.0	119.72	45.297

-Wilcoxon 2-Sample Test (Normal Approximation)
S= 1449.50 Z= -1.25290 Prob /Z/= 0.2102
T-Test approximation significance = 0.2132
-Kruskal-Wallis Test (Chi-Square approximation)
CHISQ= 1.5802 DF= 1 Prob > CHISQ= 0.2087

For curriculum design the computed value of the test statistic H = 0.01533, is less than Chi-Square critical value (3.841) for df= 1 at the 0.05 level of significance. For materials preparation the computed value of H = 0.55747 which is less than Chi-Square critical value (3.841) for df =1 at the 0.05 level. For advising students the computed value of H = 0.55747 is also less than Chi-Square critical value (3.841) for df =1 at the 0.05 level of significance. For research duty H = 1.5802 is less than Chi-Square critical value (3.841) for df =1 at the 0.05 level too. According to the Kruskal Wallis H-Test this means that there is no difference between the rankings of the two groups because the computed value of H is less than the critical value of Chi-Square.

Thus, analysis of the ranks utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis Test revealed not only that the instructors or primarily instructors perform administrative duties, but also there is no difference in rank importance between them and those who described themselves as administrators and primarily administrators. Considering these duties as administrative responsibilities, the duties of budget development, evaluation of the program and its staff, recruiting and retaining students and staff and planning, described in response to question twelve stated above pertaining to the inappropriateness of the participants preparation, together indicate the necessity of providing managerial training to the graduates of ESL programs in order to help them overcome their administrative difficulties.

Administrative Problems

In Part IV, question number 19, the respondents' open-ended comments identified a number of administrative problems that they encountered while performing their administrative responsibilities. "The process of *categorizing* and *sorting* data" (Charmaz, 1983, p. 109) as a technique of the grounded theory was used in categorizing the qualitative data obtained in part IV of the questionnaire. Accordingly, after a careful scrutinizing of the participants' comments, the identified issues were categorized into (a) budgetary problems, (b) faculty and staffing problems, (c) placement problems of applied linguistics and ESL programs within the institution, (d) complicated student problems and (e) miscellaneous. Reported examples of budgetary problems include: lack of resources, small budgets, budget cuts, obtaining stable funding, a program housed in one department and whose budget is controlled by another, programs which are not allowed to expand and grow due to budget restrictions, limited funds, institutional constraints on budgets, lack of institutional financial support, and the necessity to write grants to help provide support for the program.

Faculty and staffing problems entail: lack of faculty, personnel issues, hiring freeze, hiring utilizing faculty student ratios, severe understaffing, operating with part-time instructors who are sometimes not hired until the semester is already underway, meeting teachers' needs, lack of rewards in terms of promotion and tenure, teaching and administrating at the same time, lack of secretarial help, personality conflict management, dealing with faculty members who come from a mixed combination of backgrounds and training, finding faculty with the right credentials and personalities, recruitment and retention of faculty members, having a permanent core faculty with approximately ten years experience and a young nonpermanent faculty, difficulty in assigning administrative responsibilities to subordinates, dealing with uncooperative, uncollegial faculty, dealing with faculty in the linguistics department and university personnel who have no concept of what is involved in language (especially ESL) teaching, convincing colleagues of the need to grow, convincing faculty in other departments to work in an interdisciplinary manner, finding good instructors, administrative understaffing, and having effective instructors where the students are satisfied and feel they are being well prepared (question 19).

The place of the program within the organizational structure of the institution has its own problems (some of these problems are identified in question 19 and some in 21), as well. Such problems include placement of the program in a foreign language department, the marginal status of graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs within the institution, low priority of programs, espousing two colleges in the university (Arts and Science and Education) and therefore satisfy two sets of administrative hierarchies, being taken seriously by the department, administration, and faculty, administrative support, independence of the program, representing the program within the context of more recognized disciplines, ambiguity regarding status of graduate ESL or applied linguistics programs, maintaining program integrity, lack of support, ESL programs are not valued very highly, and lack of cooperation with cultural diversity office.

Problems related to students identified in question number 19 include having so many more qualified applicants that the program can not handle (growth), excessive number of students, meeting students' needs, not enough time to get to know all students well, training graduate teacher assistants, too much spontaneous trouble-shooting and direct responsibility for applicants to the program or students in the program, recruitment and retention of students, finding enough scholarship money to help students complete the program, making sure courses are offered frequently enough and at times that students can take them, fostering community spirit among busy, committed graduate students, providing support for students to teach and study by extension, and inadequate graduate student support (funds).

Other recounted miscellaneous problems are heavy research demand, coordinating university wide policies regarding admission, physical facilities, low priority given to room assignments and office space, equipment, long term planning, too many tasks and insufficient institutional support, insufficient time for teaching, research and management, time wasting bureaucracy from outside the program, unsympathetic administrators, useless paperwork than is never necessary, overload, lack of knowledge/insight on part of university, need for administrative assistant, doing market analysis, institutional constraints on hiring policies, no release time for administrative work, no time for research, many M.A. theses to direct with no release time, not understanding the nature of ESL and the workload, limited number of classrooms, intractability of book-step curriculum, very difficult to make changes in ESL curriculum because part of it is housed in other areas, parts of the curriculum in other departments are inappropriately taught, being not prepared for materials development and curriculum evaluation, need knowledge about all aspects of program evaluation such as curriculum design, need avenues (mini-conferences) to keep updated and continue to grow in all areas, provision of adequate support structures for varied interests (EFL, K-12, etc.), expanding library holdings, and need for additional help.

The existence of such problems varies from one program to another. Problems related to budget request, budget development, budget allocation and linking planning and budgeting for achieving the program's goals are found primarily in the programs which are administered by new administrators who were not prepared for such positions and lack the experience which would enable them to handle these administrative duties. As for budget problems, faculty and personnel problems, student problems, and other miscellaneous problems, most of them exist in the programs that are supervised by untrained and inexperienced managers. Thus, previous managerial training, regardless of the method used to acquire it, and the length of time as an administrator help in minimizing and solving the problems that the administrators face while executing their duties. As one of the participants commented, on being not very successful in administering the program and having some problems, "I am a new administrator with a limited number of years of experience," and "I have not had much training in administration". On the other hand, a trained administrator who has some years of experience states that:

> With limited resources I am able to meet the many complex requirements of operating a graduate program (e.g.grant writings, management, research, course development, students recruit-ment, faculty, staffing, student advising, and liaison work with cooperating departments and the statewide advisory board for the program.

In addition, those administrators who had received some type of management training or have a considerable number of years of experience encountered less administrative problems than those who did not have such opportunities. "Because of training and experience," were the words of one of the participants, reporting why as a director of graduate program, he is very successful and having less problems. Another participant states the reasons behind being very effective and notably successful in administering his program:

> I have developed (through practical experience as a bilingual/ESL training program administrator) what I did not come to the program with. My basic instincts and academic and teaching experience form a basis for this development as an administrator and program developer.

Another participant also commenting on being very proficient and successful in executing his administrative duties:

> I have been chair of the department of English, Speech, and Foreign Languages for 15 years. The faculty of the department continued to recommend for me to stay as chair.

Satisfaction with Graduate Training

In order to investigate the relationship between the level of satisfaction current ESL and applied linguistics programs directors have with their graduate training, particularly administrative training, and their level of success in supervising their programs, the participants were asked to describe their satisfaction with the graduate training they received and their level of success in performing their responsibilities.

In describing the level of preparation for their administrative responsibilities (question number 15), as Table 5 shows, 8%, 30%, 28%, and 32% were very well prepared, fairly prepared, poorly prepared, or not at all prepared, respectively. On the other hand, their level of preparation for their academic preparation (question number 11) was 52% (very well prepared), 39% (fairly well prepared), 6% (poorly prepared) and 3% (not at all prepared). The following table provides a clear comparison between academic and administrative preparation.

Table 9

Satisfaction with Academic and Administrative Preparation

Preparation	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Poorly Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied
Academic	52.0%	39.0%	6.0%	3.0%
Administrative	8.0%	30.0%	28.0%	32.0%

The percentages in Table 9, pertaining to academic and administrative preparation, indicate that ESL and applied linguistics programs are doing very well in preparing their students to assume academic responsibilities. However, the same is not true for their preparation for administrative (nonacademic) responsibilities. Does this inadequate administrative preparation have an impact on the level of success of ESL and applied linguistics programs directors in the performance of their administrative responsibilities?

Level of Success in Performing Administrative Duties

In survey question 17, the participants were asked to describe their level of effectiveness or success in executing their administrative responsibilities. Surprisingly, even though in question 15, 60% of the participants reported that they were poorly or not at all prepared for administrative duties when they graduated from their programs, 42%, 45%, and 10% described their administrative performance as very effective, fairly effective, and somewhat effective, respectively. The reasons behind such effectiveness, as reported by the participants themselves in Part III, question 18, are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10

Reasons for Administrative Effectiveness*

Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective
1. Length or period as an administrator	1. Being a new administrator with limited years of experience.	1. Moderately successful in garning faculty and resources.
2. Popularity of the program	2. Having good interpersonal skills.	2. Budget problems
3. General viability and success of the program director training.	3. Believe in participative management theory.	3. Lack of cooperation with other disciplines.
4. Observing other effective administrators	4. Lack of administrative training	4. Not enough release time to be effective
5. Well established administrative structure	5. Large size of the program.	5. Overload.
6. Because of administrative training received.	6. Not enough support from the institution	6. Poor politician

Table 10, Con't.

Reasons for Administrative Effectiveness*

Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective
7. Knowing the goals of the program.	7. Severely understaffed	
8. Comments by internal and external observers.	8. Having few support services.	
9. Being able to operate with limited resources.		
10. Consistent record of success.		
11. Staff like their work situation.		
12. Growth of the program.		

*In question 17, no responses were given for the "ineffective" option.

As Table 10 shows, among the reasons behind being very effective are the length of time the director has served as an administrator, receiving managerial training through graduate studies, in-service training and observing effective successful administrators, adopting participative management theory, planning skills and setting goals for the program, and ability to operate within limited budgets. Lack of administrative training, having limited years of experience, large size of the program, lack of institution support, budget problems, lack of coordination with other disciplines, and overload are among the reasons behind being effective or somewhat effective.

Do the results shown in Table 6 pertaining to being effective as an administrator mean that there is a relationship between the effectiveness of the administrator and (a) his or her previous administrative training (question 15), (b) the number of years he/she has served as an administrator (question four) and size of the program (question three)? Does this also mean that there is a relationship between the categories of problems the director faces and (a) his/her previous administrative training, and (b) the number of years he/she has served as an administrator?

In order to determine whether or not there is a statistical independence between the level of satisfaction that the current directors have with their graduate training, pertaining to administrative preparation, and their level of effectiveness in performing their managerial responsibilities, the test of independence (Chi Square) was calculated. The value of Chi-Square required for significance at the 0.05 level for df=2 is 5.99. The obtained value of Chi-Square = 4.818 does not exceed the value required for significance (See appendix F Table 1). Clearly the directors level of effectiveness in executing administrative duties is independent of their level of satisfaction.

In contrast, statistical analysis discloses that there is not statistical independence between the effectiveness of the program administrator and his/her previous managerial training. The obtained value of Chi-Square = 10.741 exceeds the value required for significance at the .05 level (5.99). Apparently, the level of effectiveness of the program administrator is not independent of the previous administrative training the director received. Table 11 shows the frequencies and percentages of the effectiveness of ESL and applied linguistics program administrators.

Table 11

Effectiveness of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs Directors

Level of Effectiveness	N	Percentage
Very Effective	42	42.0
Effective	45	45.0
Somewhat Effective	9	9.0
Did Not Specify	4	4.0

N= 100

As Table 11 shows 42% and 45% of the current directors describe themselves as very effective and effective, respectively. Part of this effectiveness comes from the previous managerial training those directors received outside of their graduate programs such as enrolling in management and leadership courses, in-service training, practice and experience, or getting help from a colleague. Table 12 illustrates the source of managerial training the current directors received before they embarked on supervising ESL and applied linguistics programs and while they are administering such programs.

Table 12

Sources of Administrative Training

Source	N	Percentage
1. Through the graduate program	23	23.0
2. Enrolling in management courses later	05	5.0
3. In-service training	24	24.0
4. Practice and experience	91	91.0
5. Asking for help from a colleague	69	69.0

As is shown in the table above, practice and experience and asking for help from a colleague constitute the main source for administrative skills training utilized for managing ESL and applied linguistics programs. Does this suggest that the effectiveness or success of the program director depends on his/her experience as a program administrator? Statistical analysis does provide a positive answer to this question.

In running the test of independence in order to determine the type of relationship between the effectiveness or success of the program administrator and the length of time he/she served as an administrator, the obtained value of Chi-Square = 10.741 exceeds the required value for significance at .05 (5.99) levels for df=2 (See Appendix F Table 1). Thus, the effectiveness of the program director is not independent of the time he/she served as an administrator for an ESL or applied linguistics program. Table 13 shows the period of time such administrators served in administering their programs.

Table 13

Length of Time as an Administrator

Period	N	Percentage
1. 0-2 years	18	18.0
2. 3-5 years	29	29.0
3. 6-10 years	19	19.0
4. 11 years or longer	34	34.0

N= 100

Administrative Training

In order to improve preparation for administrative responsibilities, in question number 20 the participants were requested to identify the elements that they believe will assist in achieving this goal. The categorizing and sorting technique of the qualitative grounded theory method was used to categorize the respondents statements. After close scrutinizing of the data, the following categories are recommended. The first category includes developing management and administrative courses, sending graduate students to other departments such as education, public policy, and business where such courses are offered, developing courses in interpersonal relationships, case studies, practicum in other programs, a seminar course which would allow participants to work on topic of their own choice, adding administrative duties skills to current available courses such as curriculum design, and general course in administration that will help in preparing administrators for program design, program evaluation, establishing priorities, advisement, supervision, and evaluating applicants to the graduate programs. Offering administration internships with well recognized and effective directors, internships in metropolitan and suburban businesses, participation of students in departmental committees and involving them in decision-making processes constitutes the elements of the second category. Third, developing workshops such as summer workshops, holding a biweekly colloquium, in-service training, mentoring on the job are some of the elements identified in the the third category.

Organizational Placement of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs

In Part IV of the survey, question number 21, the participants were requested to point out significant issues pertaining to the organizational placement of graduate ESL/Applied Linguistics programs in the academic structure of their institutions. Important issues that the participants named include: how such programs are regarded vis-a-vis other programs, independence and autonomy of the program, having an equal status with other divisions, maintaining coordination with other departments, placing ESL programs in departments that will give them adequate attention and resources, placing MA/ESL programs in two different colleges (Liberal Arts and Sciences college and College of Education), separating the undergraduate ESL composition, the undergraduate ESL speech course, and the Intensive English Program (IEP) from the graduate ESL program, relationship of MA/ESL programs to the on-campus language institute, relationship of MA/ESL programs to other disciplines (should its affiliation be closer to education, linguistics, or languages), integration with respectful academic departments, percent of tuition fees the program is allowed to keep, academic respect, low priority and support of ESL programs are not a priority when it comes to support, differentiating between credit versus non-credit courses, the program should be in a visible setting within the academic mainstream of the university, is the program motivated by academic concerns or economic concerns?, greater recognition of the services which the program provides, better accommodation for research support to faculty and for program development, autonomy of the program, no one wants the ESL program to be in their department, and recognition by the central administration that ESL programs are an important facet of the school of education.

ESL and Applied Linguistics Program Sizes

As Table 15 shows, the sizes of graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs are different from one institution to another as identified by the participants in question three. These sizes range from having only one full time faculty member to fifteen members or more. The place of these programs, regardless of the number of full-time faculty members, are different in the participating institutions (question one).

Table 14

Places of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs

Place	N	Percentage
1. Has its own department	9	9.0
2. Within an English department	31	31.0
3. Within a modern language dept.	7	7.0
4. Other	53	53.0

N= 100

Table 15

Sizes of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs

Number of Full-time Faculty	N	Percentage
1. 1-5 members	44	44.0
2. 6-15 members	27	27.0
3. 15 members or larger	27	27.0
4. Did not specify	2	2.0

N= 100

In running the test of independence to determine whether the two variables are independent of each other, the obtained value of Chi-Square = 5.534. The value of Chi-Square required for significance at the 0.05 level for df=2 is 5.99 (See Appendix F Table 1). The obtained value does not exceed the value required for significance. Therefore, it is clear that the place of ESL and applied linguistics programs is independent of the size of the program. That is, having a large ESL or applied linguistics program does not play an important role in placing the ESL program.

Likewise, having a large ESL program does not determine the role of the person in charge (question five). The obtained value of Chi-Square = 1.626 less than the value required for significance at the .01 level (9.21) for df=2 (See Appendix F table 1). Obviously, the role of the person in charge of the program as an administrator, primarily an administrator with instructional duties, an instructor, or an instructor with administrative duties is independent of the size of the program. Table 16 summarizes the roles of ESL and applied linguistics programs as they described themselves in question number 5.

Table 16

Roles of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs Directors

Role	*N	Percentage
An administrator	10	10.0
Primarily an administrator with instructional duties	21	21.0
An instructor	08	08.
Primarily an instructor with administrative duties	64	64.0

*N=103

Summary

Data analysis revealed that a large percentage of the current ESL and applied linguistics programs (80.0%) do not provide their graduate students with any type of administrative training. Accordingly, the participants reported that they encountered problems relevant to the administrative aspects of their programs. Examples of these problems are budget, faculty and staffing, students, and placement with respect to ESL and applied linguistics programs.

Data analysis disclosed also that the current directors praised their preparation for their academic responsibilities, but not for their administrative duties. However, they reported that they were very effective (42.0%) and effective (45.0%) in executing their administrative responsibilities. But, such effectiveness was due to administrative training received after graduation. Therefore, the participants recommended some elements such as courses, internships, colloquia, workshops, and other avenues that the current programs should adopt to overcome the deficiency.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This chapter is composed of three sections. In the first section, a discussion of the types of administrative training offered by graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs to their graduate students, the administrative responsibilities of ESL and applied linguistics program directors and their preparation for assuming these duties, and the problems that the administrators face while executing their managerial duties and the reasons behind them is presented in the first section.

The administrative components of the programs from which the current directors graduated, and their appropriateness in preparing them for their administrative responsibilities, the level of satisfaction that the current directors have with their academic and administrative graduate training and its relationship to their success or effectiveness in performing their administrative duties is discussed in the second section.

In the last section of this chapter the placement of ESL and applied linguistics programs in the organizational structure of higher education institutions, pros and cons of such Placements, and the relationship between the placement of these programs, on one hand, and the sizes of these programs and the role of persons in charge as administrators, administrators with instructional duties, instructors, or instructors with administrative duties will be discussed.

Appropriateness of Administrative Training

As data analysis disclosed, only 16% of the programs from which the current directors graduated required or encouraged its students to take administrative courses either from their programs or through other programs that offer such courses. In contrast, slightly more (20-25%) of the current programs that the current directors supervise provide their clients with managerial training or are in the process of designing elements that provide their students with the necessary managerial acumen. Data analysis indicates that there is an increase in programs which are beginning to see a need and are offering such training.

The reason behind such increase might be the growth of the ESL field and the demand for not only teachers and researchers, but also for administrators, as well. Such administrators are required to manage ESL programs at all levels. Another reason might be the frustration that ESL graduates encounter when they are asked to direct an ESL program or an English department in a foreign situation where English is taught either as a foreign language or as a second language.

The low percentage (8%), of those who indicated that they were very well prepared for their current administrative duties because of previous managerial training offered by the programs from which they graduated, reported that they experienced less problems and were notably successful in directing their programs. As one of the participants stated commenting on how his previous managerial training was a considerable advantage for him in administering the program:

> With limited resources I am able to meet the many complex requirements of operating a graduate program (e.g. grant writings, management, research, course development, student recruitment, faculty, staffing, student advising, liaison work with cooperating departments and statewide advisory board for the program.

On the contrary, the large percentage (58%) of those who were poorly or not at all prepared because of the lack of administrative elements in their programs or where they were not advised to take such courses through other programs faced compound problems pertaining to the administrative aspects of their programs. These problems ranged from being unable to develop a budget request, allocate resources effectively and efficiently, attract and retain good faculty members or to resolve personal conflicts between faculty members, link strategic planning and budgeting or set achievable goals for the program, and design and develop an appropriate curriculum that meets the needs of the students. In the words of one of the participants mentioning the reasons behind being only somewhat successful in directing his program, "I have not had ... training in administration".

As a result of this inappropriate or nonexistent administrative training, ESL and applied linguistics graduates turn to other avenues for acquiring administrative skills in order to run their programs more effectively. Among these avenues are struggling the first year in administering the program until one develops some skills by trial and error (47%), seeking help from a colleague who has been educated in administration or has a track record of experience in administrative problem solving (36%), developing management skills through in-service training (12%) in the institutions that offer such training to fill the lack of administrative skills gap, or (for those of the graduates who realize the necessity for administrative skills), enrolling in management courses that provide them with what their programs did not.

The findings suggest that, this void could be eliminated if the directors of graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs developed courses, either required or as electives, or advised their students, particularly those who are interested in administration or are anticipating directing an ESL program after graduation, to take such courses through other programs such as educational administration, public policy or business. Ideally, having the courses in one's own program is the best way to ameliorate this present situation. Another way would be administrative internships. In the words of one of the participants calling for filling such a breach in ESL and applied linguistics programs:

> We are working on developing an internship in ESL program admin-istration. This, I believe, is a significant gap in ESL professional preparation that needs filling.

Utilizing the aforementioned strategies would assist new directors in acquiring at least the minimum administrative expertise that would form the basis for developing other more complex skills through practice and experience.

The significance of developing management courses or advising students to seek such courses through other programs is supported by the results of the present study. Of the participants, 79% reported that it is very important, important or somewhat important to include managerial training in the graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs. Such large percentages indicate the distress and frustration that the current directors experience before developing the required administrative skills via practice and experience, asking help from a friend or a colleague, in-service training, or enrolling in management courses after graduation to acquire skills not provided by the ESL and applied linguistics programs. This overwhelming obstacle is needless considering the ease with which solutions might be implemented.

Such significance was not only indicated by circling one of the four options in question number 16 (See Appendix C), but also through the participants' qualitative comments in questions number 20 and 21. For instance, a participant identifying some elements for improving preparation for administrative responsibilities stated that:

> MA students probably do not have time for such courses-better at the Ph.D. level. They need knowledge of theory, practice, curriculum/material design, budget and personnel management.

Another director of both a master and a doctoral program commenting on the significance of including such courses and the benefit the students gain from taking such courses stated that:

> At MA level its all we can do to keep the # [number] of courses we think essential. Such students should be offered course options in administration, [and] management as options. In Ph.D. programs they should be required. My own program [program the director graduated from] offered an elective course in curriculum design. I have used that information a lot.

Elements that provide graduates with administrative skills such as internships "are a definite requirement", courses "can provide some of the knowledge and skills" and observing an effective successful administrator through an internship "is the best teacher", as one of the participants stated.

Acknowledging the current situation of the ESL and applied linguistics programs pertaining to their priority in higher education institutions, understaffing, budget cuts, restrictions on growth and as second class programs (as some higher education administrators look at them):

> These elements [new courses and internships] are important and easily implemented *if* valued by all faculty members. TESL/TEFL programs tend to

> be overloaded already (... TESL courses). However, training in administration aspects is important because most graduates will find themselves taking on such duties gradually once they graduate.

The foregoing is quoted from the response of one of the participants commenting on the situation of graduate ESL programs and the importance of developing administrative courses in order to graduate not only teachers and researchers but also prospective leaders and managers.

That is, it is not enough that graduates of ESL and applied linguistics programs are acquainted with the most recent methodologies of second/foreign language teaching and theories of second/foreign language acquisition, it is also very important to be proficient in curriculum design, requesting, developing and allocating a budget where ESL and applied linguistics programs have control over their budgets, evaluating an ESL program and its staff, recruiting and retaining staff and students, and planning and setting goals for their programs. Thus, in the words of one of the participants,

> there should definitely be elective courses, a track of three-five courses, perhaps cross listed in educational administration available within master's and Ph.D. tracks.

Preparation for Administrative Duties

The results of the present study indicate significant deficiencies in the ESL and applied linguistics programs pertaining to the preparation of their graduates for assuming leadership positions in their fields. For curriculum design, as one of the most significant administrative duties, 21% of the graduates are poorly or not at all prepared upon graduation from their programs. The duties of the first post-M.A. jobs "included materials preparation 38%, curriculum design 33% and administration 24%" (Day, 1984, p. 112).

Such graduates, if they are not well prepared at least for the above duties, will end up seeking help through other avenues. For developing a budget, 78% of the graduates are poorly or not at all prepared. Of the graduates, 43% do not have the skills for evaluating their programs. Pertaining to the current directors, 60% lack the appropriate skills for recruiting staff and students and retaining them, and 39% of them do not know how to plan and set goals for their programs. Such results are consistent with the findings of Ochsner (1980) who states that:

> Over half the students felt "Very Much Prepared" by their M.A. program for all but two areas, publishing and doing administrative work .... Four out of five students "Knew Little or Nothing" about administrative work [81%] (p. 203)

In addition to this, Ochsner's (1980) results that both M.A. and Ph.D. students reported that their training was inadequate for publications (23% were unprepared) and administrative work (49% were unprepared) are consistent with the findings of the present study.

The results of the present study indicate the necessity of developing and including administrative courses that provide graduate students with the essential skills for administering their programs. Inadequate management and administrative training is the reason for the majority of problems, mentioned in chapter four, that the current directors face. This becomes more clear if we remember that most of the problems were encountered by those administrators who were new to their positions, lacked administrative training, practice and experience. Thus, it is secure to argue that having administrative training would at least minimize the problems and provide the new directors with the basic skills on which they can build other complex management skills. This research indicates that M.A. and doctoral ESL programs should provide administrative training "given the percentage of those who reported that their duties included administration, particularly, in positions assumed later in their careers" (Day, 1984, p. 123).

The necessity for developing administrative elements that provide graduates with the appropriate skills for managing their programs becomes more obvious if we know that meeting with students, e.g. for advising or counseling, correspondence related to recruitment and enrollment, public relations and personalized marketing, promotion and recruitment, public relations with the university and community, faculty hiring, supervision, and evaluation, program evaluation and management and curriculum design are the most time-consuming and important activities of ESL program directors. Time management, negotiating for recognition and resources with the university, and money management are the most difficult activities according to Pennington (1993).

Such inadequate administrative preparation for managerial skills unequivocally will lead to dissatisfaction with the graduate training offered by ESL and applied linguistic programs. As data analysis revealed, 60% of the current directors are poorly or not at all prepared for their administrative positions. Such graduates, as a result, have little praise for their programs and as a consequence rate them unfavorably. On the contrary, one should expect them to have a high level of satisfaction with their academic preparation which has only 9% who are poorly or not prepared at all for their academic duties. Even this small percentage of inadequate academic preparation might not be due to the programs, but to personal factors. ESL and applied linguistics graduates should be satisfied not only with their academic preparation, but also with their administrative education. This satisfaction is unlikely unless the current program directors take the initiative and pay some attention to this breach in ESL and applied linguistics programs.

The high effectiveness that the current directors reported in this study is due to acquiring the managerial skills outside the ESL and applied linguistics programs. That is, through practice and experience, in-service training, seeking help from colleagues, and enrolling in management courses after graduation. It would be preferable and more rewarding if the current directors could report their high satisfaction and rate of success for the administrative training that they received through their graduate training.

Good human relations, planning and organizational skills and flexibility, which are not offered by the current ESL professional preparation programs, are some of the key factors for success in job performance. Problems dealing with higher level administration, the inability to secure sufficient physical and human resources for the program, and poor decisions in hiring faculty are among the reasons behind ineffectiveness and failure on the job (Pennington, 1993).

Since the level of success in administering a program depends on the level of satisfaction one has with his/her administrative training, including management and administrative training in ESL programs, it becomes a necessity to offer appropriate instruction either through the same program or through other programs on campus. This high correlation between level of satisfaction and level of success also indicates the significance of developing such courses as reported by participants in Table 3 (page 61) entitled *Significance of Including Administrative Training in Graduate ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs.*

The significance and necessity of offering management training to prospective ESL program directors is expressed by the participants in Pennington's (1993) study. In an open-ended question "Do you have any advice to offer a future program administrator in your position" (Pennington, 1993, p. 37), the participants provided some advice related to learning practical management skills, including (1) training as a teacher/scholar/linguist is not enough for supervising a program, (2) trying an assistant director position before becoming a full-time director, (3) learning budget request, development and allocation, (4) taking a management seminar in conflict resolution and motivation, (5) getting special training in personnel management, and (6) taking management and accounting courses, are among the advice that the participants offered to those anticipating jobs in the ESL field. In addition, the participants advised prospective directors to foster a cooperative management style in directing their programs.

A relationship also exists between the preparation for administrative duties and the effectiveness of program administrators in their administrative styles (See Table 7, p. 75). This indicates the importance of designing management courses in the programs which did not offer such training. This does not discount the exceptional personal characteristics which may aid many successful administrators in being more effective than other directors who lack such characteristics. In brief, providing management training, through one's program or other programs, positively impacts the overall effectiveness of administrators.

The current results provide an appropriate answer to Reasor's (1986) concern about "why 62% of the administrators ... perceived themselves to be ineffective ...". The answer that this study provides is that those administrators who have not received any kind of management training rated themselves as not effective in executing their administrative duties; and those who reported that they were very effective or effective in performing their duties, did so due to previous managerial training or training acquired on the job.

Another question which was also raised by Reasor's study (1986), and this researcher, is the question of whether ESL administrators received the appropriate administrative training. The results of the present study revealed that 60% of the current directors are poorly or not at all prepared for the jobs which they are doing. Thus, being somewhat effective or ineffective is not due to any lack of effort or shortcoming on their part. They were trained as teachers and scholars, rather than as administrators.

The effectiveness of the current program administrators has a relationship, even if it is not very strong, with the length of time he/she served as an administrator. This indicates that practice and experience is one of the most frequently utilized avenues through which administrators acquire their administrative skills. More accurately, it is the only source of information for most of the administrators who have not received any kind of management training. This becomes more clear if we know that 91% of the participants reported that practice and experience was one of the main sources of administrative skills acquired through supervising their programs regardless of their places in the organizational structure of institutions.

Placement of ESL and Applied Linguistics Programs

The precise placement of ESL programs within the academy is undefined. Its placement varies greatly from institution to institution. Where a program is housed impacts the power that faculty will have in institutional decision making and on how others in the institution view that discipline. It also affects the academy's views and how it values the instruction and research undertaken. If ESL and applied linguistics programs are to develop and flourish as a serious academic discipline, they must be defined not only in terms of theory and pedagogy, but also in terms of their placement within the academic institutions.

The findings revealed that 9% of ESL programs have their own department, 28% are housed in the English department, 2% are housed both in the English department and modern languages department, 1% are housed in both an English and another department, and 53% of these programs are housed in the "other" category which the respondents identified as: School of Education, Linguistics Department, Department of Curriculum and Instruction in Foreign Language Education/ESL, Applied Linguistics, Bicultural-Bilingual Studies, Interdisciplinary Program, Graduate Education Department, Languages and Linguistics, Foreign and Second Language Education, International and Intercultural Studies Department, Department of Speech and Communication, Language and Education Department, Department of Learning and Instruction, Graduate School of Education, English Department and Foreign Language Department.

The results of this study suggest that establishing an ESL program as a separate program, where it is possible, would increase benefits to students, faculty and the discipline. Students benefit because they are taught by faculty interested and trained in the education of ESL. Thus, they have a better opportunity to have their special needs met. Faculty benefit because they are recognized as professionals and are evaluated in terms of their discipline. They have greater potential flexibility and independence in curriculum development, and they are self-governing and guaranteed representation in institutional governance. The discipline benefits in that it has autonomy to develop its own theory and philosophy, to collaborate with other faculty as an equal, to develop partnerships within and outside the institution.

Placing the ESL program within an English department has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of placing an ESL program within an English department are that students have the feeling of being part of the mainstream, and that faculty have the feeling of being part of a large and powerful group. The disadvantages of placing ESL programs in the English department are that the faculty are often marginalized within a structure consisting of a coordinator/director and numerous adjunct faculty, their research is often less valued than literary research, and they are seldom seen as capable of representing the English departments' interests. There is also a chance that traditional English faculty will be recruited to teach ESL courses when the need arises. This diminishes ESL as a discipline. As a result of such problems and others mentioned in chapter four, some of the participants reported that they did not like being placed in the English department. For instance, one of the participants stated that:

> We should not be in an English Department,
> which has no interest in us.

Placing the ESL programs in the Modern Language Department shows the disparity between ESL and modern languages. Such placement does not appear to support ESL research, practice, or the development of ESL as a discipline. In addition to this the likelihood is great that any language teacher will be seen as capable of teaching ESL courses.

Placing the ESL program in several departments causes numerous difficult issues. ESL faculty members are prevented from achieving autonomy and often find themselves squabbling among themselves over academic territory. They have little chance of attaining representation in institutional governance. Such fragmentation of instruction also continually fosters the idea that ESL is a stepchild of more traditional disciplines.

Housing the ESL program in a single department whether it be English, Modern Languages, or others promotes the idea that the ESL faculty are discipline-related professionals. However, it also leads to the marginalization of ESL faculty and it often defines ESL itself in terms of the parent department whether that be English, Modern Languages, or others. This arrangement does not provide a coherent framework for the development of ESL as an academic discipline. Is such placement of ESL programs determined by variables such as the size of the program? Surprisingly, the size of the ESL program neither proposes that the program will have its own department or plays any role in placing it within the institution nor does it determine the role of the person administering the program. The reasons behind such results might be the ambiguity regarding the status of ESL programs, the marginal status of ESL programs, ESL programs having low priority, ESL programs not being valued very highly, lack of support and having to deal with university personnel who have no idea about what is involved in ESL programs.

The implications and recommendations on the basis of the discussion of the results of this study pertaining to the placement and administrative aspects of ESL programs, the provision of managerial training, and the administrative elements suggested by the participants to improve the ESL field and the preparation of prospective directors of ESL programs will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 6

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter is composed of three main sections. A summary of the findings of this study is presented in the first section. Conclusions which are suggested by the study are presented in the second section. In the last section recommendations for improving administrative training of current and prospective ESL and applied linguistics program administrators are presented.

Summary

This study discerned that it is desirable to integrate management and leadership training into the curriculum of the graduate ESL and applied linguistics programs. Such a widespread desire was expressed through the qualitative comments of the participants as well as through the quantitative analysis of their responses.

The reasons behind such strong support from participants who would like to see ESL programs providing their students with management training was that, as the results of the present study indicated, the programs from which the current directors graduated typically offered them no such training. Such directors, when they began supervising an ESL program, realized the significance of such training. Therefore, they would like to see the current programs developing such courses or offering them through other programs. Of the current programs, 15% offer administrative training through their programs and only 5% are in the process of developing such courses.

Such managerial training is expected to prepare prospective program directors for their diverse administrative responsibilities. These managerial duties entail: developing and designing a curriculum, requesting, developing, and allocating a budget, evaluating the program and its faculty and staff, recruiting and retaining staff and students, planning and setting achievable goals for one's program and other miscellaneous duties such as materials preparation, and advising students. As a result of not receiving any management training, as the present study disclosed, the directors experienced problems pertaining to budget development, faculty and staffing, students, curriculum, evaluation, planning, and other miscellaneous issues.

Consequently, they sought different avenues for acquiring the administrative skills that their positions require to ameliorate the problems they encounter while executing their administrative duties. Some of those avenues were enrolling in management courses and seminars later on, in-service training, depending on one's practice and experience, or asking help from a colleague. Practical experience and seeking help from a co-worker were the most frequently utilized alternatives.

The satisfaction of the participants with regard to the administrative training provided by the programs from which they graduated was very poor. 60% of the participants were poorly or not at all satisfied with their administrative training. On the contrary 91% of them were very satisfied with their academic training. This means that, most if not all, graduate ESL programs are focusing on the academic aspects of the profession and totally ignoring or paying very little attention to the administrative skills required from those scholars who embark on the supervision or administration of a program.

As a result of the lack of managerial training, the participants assessed their programs unfavorably pertaining to administrative training. In spite of this evaluation, the participants reported that they were successful in performing their administrative duties. Some of the reasons behind their effectiveness or success, as they reported, were length of time as an administrator, observing other successful administrators, administrative training acquired, and ability to set goals for the program.

In order to improve and provide managerial training through the professional graduate ESL preparation programs, some conclusions and recommendations will be presented in the following two sections based on the results of the study and the suggestions of the current ESL program directors who constituted the population of this study.

Conclusions and Implications

This study has shown that there is a universal set of competencies that all program directors and chairpersons consider necessary for their vocations. Being an effective director or chairperson, therefore, requires a blend of interpersonal as well as managerial competencies. The value of identifying such competencies is two-fold. First, it can provide guidance for the selection of new directors or chairpersons. Second, it can provide the basis of developing courses and workshops that provide administrative skills instruction for current and prospective administrators.

The competences necessary for directors and chairpersons which are considered essential for any administrative position are also consequential for faculty members. This is because, as some of the respondents stated, faculty members are always involved in the governance of their department or programs, particularly those which adopt the participative management theory. Another reason for all faculty members to be equipped with the administrative skills is that directors and chairpersons always come from their ranks.

Regardless of the title of the person in charge of the program (division chair, coordinator/director or instructor with administrative duties) he/she is considered an administrator and an educator who should be ready to chair a department or supervise a program when his/her turn comes or when nominated or to do so. If individuals trained as researchers, scholars and teachers assume the new, complex, and distinct role of a director or department chairperson without any sort of prior training or preparation they will experience serious administrative difficulties.

If this education is not available when one becomes a director/coordinator or a chairperson, can we assume it will become available when one becomes a dean, when the dean becomes vice president, or when the vice president becomes a president? Perhaps this explains, in part, why higher education finds itself facing a great many problems for which its leaders are unprepared or poorly trained. To continue to place higher education in the hands of those not intimately acquainted with the nature, role, and functions of higher education, the professoriate and the students, would be a serious mistake.

Finally, another important conclusion is that 47% of the current directors or chairpersons have been in their positions for less than five years. They are relatively new to the complexities of higher education administration as well as to departmental operations and responsibilities. Also, because a large percentage of administrators have not had any formal training for their positions, apparently much of academic administration is left to chance, even though the administrators themselves long for the availability of adequate specific training. The lack of administrative preparation and the large number of participants in this study wanting instruction shows a need for more programs of pre-service and/or in-service training for current and prospective administrators.

Recommendations

The conclusions and implications drawn from the empirical data are extremely important to the future of higher education in general and to higher education administration in particular. The large response rate adds strength to the study's findings. At the very least, the study identified some of the managerial responsibilities of ESL program directors, in particular, and of the directors, chairpersons and coordinators of academic programs at the university level in general. Specifically, the following recommendations, based on the results of the study, can be advanced.

First, the academic preparation of ESL program directors readies them only to be effective educators and productive scholars and does not prepare them for the administrative duties required by their positions. Therefore, as the results of the study suggest, designing a course or a seminar in management practices such as developing a budget, evaluation skills, promotion, recruitment and retention, program planning and organization and other personnel management skills is imperative.

Second, because ESL directors and other academic directors must understand the organizational structure of higher education institutions, politics of educational institutions and the process of decision making, it becomes significant to include educationally-oriented as well as business-oriented information as part of the management training of ESL program directors.

Third, a course, seminar, or an internship might be an important addition, where it is possible, to the ESL preparation programs. Understanding the current economic situation of higher education institutions in general, and the budget problems the current ESL programs are facing in particular, graduate programs in ESL might consider offering the option of taking a course in educational administration or management in other departments as an elective towards a graduate degree for those who are interested in program administration.

Fourth, for the new directors who are already in service and would like to improve their administrative skills, summer courses in program administration are given periodically at the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) summer institute. Workshops and conference presentations on aspects of ESL program administration are available at TESOL and the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) conferences.

Finally, as the results of the study disclosed, practice and experience is one of the most important avenues for acquiring administrative skills. Prospective ESL program administrators could benefit from observing experienced administrators or working for them as an internship like that done for acquiring teaching experience. Such opportunities for educational and practical experiences will strengthen the management skills of such administrators and provide them with the balance of educational and management expertise required for their positions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, P. (1977). English for speakers of other languages: A survey of teacher preparation programs in America and British colleges and universities. In F. Fanselow, & Richard L. (Eds.), *Bilingual, ESOL and foreign language teacher preparation: Models, practices, issues* (pp. 69-81). Washington, D. C.: TESOL.

Alexander, P. (1981). Learning from the Japanese. *Personnel Journal,*(August), 616-119.

Bare, A. C. (1980). The study of academic department performance. *Research In Higher Education*, 12, 3-22.

Barrett, R. P. (1982). *The administration of intensive English language programs.* Washington, D. C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Baum, E. (1983). Evaluating the evaluation process for academic administrators. *College and University,* 58, 182-193.

Bennett, J. (1990). The dean and the department chair: Toward greater collaboration. *Educational Record,* (Winter), 24-26.

Cangemi, J. P. (1985). A pragmatist's view of participative management. In J. Cangemi, C. Kowalski, and J. Claypool (Eds.), *Participative Management: Employee-Management Cooperation* (1-9). New York: Philosophical Library.

Caroll, A. B. (1974). Role conflict in academic organizations: An exploratory examination of the department chairman's experience. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 10, 51-64.

Charmaz, K. (1983). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In M. Smith (Ed.), Introduction to qualitative research (pp. 17-34). Arizona: Kinkos Professor Publishing.

Coffin, B. A. (1979, Sep/Nov.). The role of the chairman. *ADE Bulletin*, 81.

Day, R.R. (1984). Career aspects of graduate training in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly,* 18(1), 109-123.

Deegan, L. W. (1981). *Managing student affairs programs.* California: ETC Publications.

Di Pietro, et al. (1983). The graduate foreign language curriculum. *The Modern Language Journal,*67, 365-373.

Ediger, M. (1985). Issues in educational administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 253974)

Escobar, J. & Daugherty J. (1975). *Handbook for the ESL/ABE administrator, books 1-2*. Arlington Heights, IL: Bilingual Education Center.

Featherstone, R. L. and L. Romano. (1983). Evaluation of administrative performance. In E. Zappulla (Ed.), *Evaluating administrative performance: Current trends and techniques* (pp. 259-273). Belmont, CA: Star Publishing Co.

Ferguson, G. A., and Yoshio Takane. (1989). Statistical analysis in psychology and . education. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Fisher, C. F. (1977, June). The evaluation and development of college and university administrators, part two: Professional development of administrators. *College and University Bulletin*, 5.

Fox, R. P. (1988). ESL program administration in higher education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 303045.

Francis, H. H. (1962). The organizations of colleges and universities. In P. Gerald Burns (Ed.), *Administrators in higher education*. New York: Harper and Bros.

Fry, M. E. (1986). *Selected perceptions of English-as-a-second-language programs in postsecondary institutions in the United States*. Unpublished Disst. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

Gibson, R. C. (1969). *The challenge of leadership in higher education*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co. Publishers.

Gmelch, W. H. (1991). Paying the price for academic leadership: department chair tradeoffs. *Educational Record*, (Summer), 45-48.

Heimler, C. H. (1967). The college department chairman. *Educational Record*, (Summer), 158-163.

Hill W., & Wendel L. F. (1967). Perceptions of the power of department chairmen by professors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, (March), 548-574.

Jarvis, G. A., & Adams, S. J. (1979). *Evaluating a second language program*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Jennerich, J. E. (1978). The department chairperson as instructional catalyst. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 178 003)

Jennerich, J. E. (1981). Competencies for department chairpersons: Myths and realities. *Liberal Education* (Spring), 46-70.

Johns, A. (1981). Why a good staff stays and performs. In B. Byrd, *ATESL Program Management*. Panel presented at the 33rd annual conference of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, Nashville.

Johnson, D. (1985). Results of a national survey of graduates of bilingual education programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 59-77.

Katz, R. L. (1974). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 52, 90-102.

Kowalski, J. and Bryson, J. (1985). Participatory management in organizations of Higher Education. In J. Cangemi, C. Kowalski and J. Claypool (Eds.), *participative management: employee-management cooperation*(pp.123- 132). New York: Philosophical Library, Inc.

Lawer, E. (1986). *High-involvement management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Locke, E. A. & Latham, G. P. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Margolis, B. L., W. H. Kross, & R. B. Quinn. (1974). Job stress: An unlisted occupational hazard. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 16, 659-651.

Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Mason, R. D., and Doglass A. Lind. (1990). Statistical techniques in business and economics. Boston, MA: IRWIN.

Mathies, B. F. (1983). *A study of the characteristics, qualifications, and perceived roles of the directors of intensive ESL programs*. Unpublished Disst. University of Illinois, Urban.

Mathies, B. F. (1984). The intensive English program directors' job skills. *The American Language Journal*, 2, 5-16.

National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) Task Force on Standards and Responsibilities. (1981) *NAFSA Principles for International Educational Exchange*. Washington D. C.: National Association for Student Affairs.

Newell, C. A. (1978). *Human behavior in educational administration*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Obradovic, J. (1978). Effects of technology and participation on attitudes towards work. In Obradovic, J. & W. Dunn (Eds), *Workers' self-management and organizational power in Yugoslavia*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

Obradovic, J. (1985). Participation as a method of conflict resolution. In Cangemi J., Casimir Kowalski & Jeffery Claypool (Eds), *Participative management: employee-management cooperation* (pp. 56-64). NY: Philosophical Library Inc.

Ochsner, R. (1980). Job-related aspects of the M. A. in TESOL degree. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(2), 199-207.

Pennington, M. C. (1984). Effective administration of an ESL program. In P. Larson, E. Judd, & D. S. Messerschmitt (Eds.), *On TESOL'84: A brave new world for TESOL* (pp. 301-316). Washington D. C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Pennington, M. C. (1993). Advice from the front lines: What every ESL program director needs to know that they didn't teach you in graduate school. *Perspectives*, 5(1), 31-41.

Pollay, R. W., R. N. Taylor, & M. Thompson. (1976). Model for horizontal power sharing and participation in university decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 47, 141-152.

Reasor, A. W. (1981). *Administrative styles of English-as-a-second language administrators*. Unpublished Disst. The American University.

Reasor, A. W. (1986). Dominant administrative styles of ESL administrators. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(2), 338-342.

Richards, J. C., & Nobuyuki H. (1983). Training ESOL teachers: The need for needs assessment. In Alatis, E. J., H. H. Stern, P. Strevens (Eds.), *Georgetown university round table on languages and linguistics* (pp. 312-326). Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Roach, J. H. (1976). The academic department chairperson. *Educational Record*, 57, 13-23.

Rosbottom, R. C. (1987). The supportive chair. *ADFL Bulletin*, 18, 3-8.

Ryan, D.W. (1972). The internal organization of academic departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, (March), 464-482.

Scanlan, B., and Roger A. (1981). Participation and the effective use of authority. *Personnel Journal*, (August), 698-703.

Siever, R., Ross, J. L., & Charles, N. (1972). Role perceptions of department chairmen in two land grant universities. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 65, 405-410.

Smith, C. (1979, Sep/Nov.). The furniture of change: An inquiry into the nature of chairs. *ADE Bulletin*, 75.

Staczek, J. J. (1991). Professional development and program administration. *TESOL Journal,* 2, 21-22, 27-28.

Staczek, J. J., & Carkin, S. J. (1985). Intensive English Program fit in traditional academic settings: Practices and promise. In P. Larson, E. Judd, & D. S. Messerschmitt (Eds.), *On TESOL 84': A brave new world for TESOL* (pp. 289-300). Washington, D. C.: TESOL.

Swales, John, & L'Estrange. (1983). ESP administration and ESP teacher training. *The ESP Journal,* 2, 87-99.

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department*. New York: American Council on Education/ Macmillan Publishing Company.

Weinbach, R. W. (1990). The social worker as manager: Theory and practice. New York: Longman.

Wilcox, G. K. (1980). *Suggested guidelines for the selection and/or preparation of ESOL program administrators*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the TESOL organization, San Francisco, California.

Wright, S. M. (1981, Nov.). What makes a program manager successful. *WATESL Newsletter*, 5-7.

APPENDIX A

FIRST MAILING COVER LETTER

February 8, 1993

Dear participant,

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to assess the background and current situation of ESL program administrators, and to determine ways to improve preparation of prospective administrators. This effort is strongly supported by the TESOL organization, particularly the program administration interest section.

Please commit a small amount of your time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. Your participation in this study and any further comments you may have are highly significant and will be held in the strictest confidence. They will be used in an anonymous form as a basis for statistical analysis. Your responses will be used only in aggregate form, and will never be reported individually.

The results will be provided to the field through a report to the research committee of the TESOL organization, publications, at least one paper presentation at a TESOL annual conference and in a published dissertation. I will also be happy to provide you with a copy of an executive summary of the results (see request slip at the end of the questionnaire).

The questionnaire has been designed in a way that most items can be answered by circling a number or providing a few words. It takes approximately fifteen minutes to complete. Enclosed you will find a stamped and addressed envelope to Arizona State University. Please complete the questionnaire and mail it as soon as possible. Your participation in this study is very important and greatly appreciated.

Most Truly,

Anwar A. Hussein
Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287-2411

APPENDIX B

SECOND FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER

February 22, 1992

Dear (Name of Participant),

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about preparation of English as a Second language programs administrators was mailed to you. Your name was taken from the *Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the United States 1992-1994.*

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small number of participants, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to ,accurately, represent the opinion of current directors of TESOL and applied linguistics graduate programs.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, collect (602-491-4014) and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Anwar A. Hussein
Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-2411

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT OF STUDY

Study of English As A Second Language/
University Program Administrator

Name (optional):________________________

Institution (optional):___________________

Please choose the most appropriate answer:

Part I. Background Information:

Note: The following questions pertain to the ESL program you are now administering.

1. What is the place of your ESL\Applied Linguistics program in the organizational structure of the university?

A. has its own department
B. within an English department
C. within a modern language department
D. other [specify]____________________

2. What is your job title?

A. Division Chair
B. Coordinator\Director
C. Instructor with administrative duties
D. Other [specify]____________________

3. What is the number of full-time faculty members in your department?

A. 1-5 members
B. 6-15 members
C. 15 members or larger

4. How long have you been an administrator?

A. 0-2 years
B. 3-5 years
C. 6-10 years
D. 11 years or longer

5. How do you describe yourself?

A. an administrator
B. primarily an administrator with instructional duties
C. an instructor
D. primarily an instructor with administrative duties

6. In addition to instruction and/or administration, what are your primary duties? (please rank any of the following duties in order of importance)

[ ] A. advising students
[ ] B. materials preparation
[ ] C. curriculum design
[ ] D. other [specify]________________
[ ] E. none of the above

7. Your current program:

A. does not provide its students with management and leadership courses
B. provides its students with management and leadership courses
C. in the process of designing such courses

8. If your program provides its students with management and leadership courses, it:

A. requires its students to take such courses from their program
B. requires its students to take such courses from other disciplines
C. encourages its student to take such courses from other disciplines
D. discourages its students to take such courses

Part II. Your Academic Training:

Note: Questions #9-15 refer to your own graduate program, i.e. the last program (master's or doctoral) from which you graduated.

9. What is your highest earned degree?

A. a doctoral degree
B. a master's degree
C. a bachelor's degree
D. other [specify]__________________

10. How well were you prepared for the following responsibilities?

Responsibility	Very well prepared	Fairly well prepared	Poorly prepared	Not at all prepared
A. Teaching	________	________	________	________
B. Research	________	________	________	________
C. Publication	________	________	________	________
D. Critical Thinking	________	________	________	________

11. Overall, how well did your program prepare you for academic responsibilities?
A. very well
B. fairly well
C. poorly
D. not at all

Part III. Administrative Training:

12. How well were you prepared for the following duties?

Duty	Very well prepared	Fairly well prepared	Poorly prepared	Not at all prepared
A. Curriculum design	________	________	________	________
B. Developing a budget	________	________	________	________
C. Evaluating an ESL Program and its staff	________	________	________	________
D. Recruiting and retaining staff and students	________	________	________	________
E. Planning and setting goals for an ESL program	________	________	________	________

13. The program you graduated from:

A. did not offer any kind of management and leadership courses
B. offered management and leadership courses in its curriculum
C. required management and leadership courses through other programs
D. encouraged taking such courses through other programs
E. discouraged taking such courses

14. If the program you graduated from did not provide you with management skills, you learned them by:

A. enrolling in management courses later Yes __ No __
B. in-service training Yes __ No __
C. practice and experience Yes __ No __
D. asking for help from a colleague Yes __ No __

15. Overall, how well did your program prepare you for administrative duties?

A. very well
B. fairly well
C. poorly
D. not at all

16. How important is it for ESL\applied linguistics programs to include leadership and management courses?

A. very important
B. important
C. somewhat important
D. not important

17. Overall, as a program administrator how do you perceive yourself?

A. very effective
B. effective
C. somewhat effective
D. ineffective

18. In question #17 you rated yourself as A, B, C, or D because:

____
____
____
____
____
____

Part IV Comments:

19. What are the problems you face as an ESL or applied linguistics program director pertaining to the administrative aspects of your program?

____
____
____
____
____
____

20. Please identify elements such as new courses and internships that might be included in ESL master and doctoral programs to improve preparation for administrative responsibilities?

____
____
____
____
____
____

21. What are significant issues pertaining to the organizational placement of ESL programs in the academic structure in your institution (or of institutions)?

____
____
____

____
____
____

22. Please comment on any question or other relevant point that you think is significant for ESL\Applied Linguistics programs administration.

____
____
____
____
____

Thank-you for your participation!

If you would like to be notified of the results of this study, please fill out the request slip below. You may mail the slip separately or with the survey (it will be detached from the questionnaire before it is read in order to preserve your anonymity).

Your help and cooperation are appreciated!

Please mail the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

Anwar A. Hussein
Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287-2411

Request slip

……………………………………………………………………

Please send me an executive summary of the results of the *English as a Second Language Program Administration* study in which I have participated.

Name:
Address:

APPENDIX D

PUBLISHED ARTICLE IN APRIL/MAY, 1993 ISSUE OF TESOL MATTERS DESCRIBING THE STUDY AND URGING CURRENT DIRECTORS PARTICIPATION

A Proposed Study for Preparation of Administrators for English as a Second Language Programs

The teaching of English as a Second Language (ESL) field began to emerge as a profession in the United States in the 1940s. Over this half-century period, one major area has received very little discussion or evaluation in the literature: ESL program administration. The administrative issues of an ESL program, regardless of its place in the organizational structure of the institution are program, faculty, students, financing and the placement of the program within the institution. Program issues entail the establishment, maintenance and effectiveness of the curriculum, planning, goals and evaluation. Faculty issues that the ESL administrator must be aware of are recruitment and retention, professional development, responsibilities and duties of the faculty, evaluation procedures, grievance procedures and dismissal policy, and involving faculty in program administration. Another area of primary concern to the ESL administrator is the attraction, recruitment, retention and program completion of students. The ESL administrator is concerned with a myriad of other issues no less important. Among these concerns are two of direct interest to a national study now being initiated, namely, financing and the location of the program within the institution.

The study is designed to investigate whether ESL and applied linguistics program administrators, at the college and university level, have received the appropriate training for the managerial responsibilities of their positions. These administrators are typically graduates of liberal arts with classroom teaching experience. Their preparation is most likely adequate for the academic context of the profession, but administrative positions require a different type of expertise. Administrative responsibilities require knowledge, skills and abilities in areas such as goal setting, decision making, group dynamics, managerial problem solving, time management, task analysis, human resources development, needs assessment, and budget planning. Such management skills have not been and are not currently included in programs leading to linguistics or ESL degrees. Nonetheless, the programs are administered by academicians who have largely learned their management skills "on the job". How well do these administrators believe they meet their administrative responsibilities? Are they satisfied with their preparation for administrative responsibilities? Could graduate programs be modified to improve management skills?

This study is expected to discern whether it is desirable to integrate management and leadership courses into the curriculum development of applied linguistics and ESL programs. More specifically, this study represents an initial effort to gauge the adequacy of the current master and doctoral programs curricula for preparing graduates for administering ESL programs. Drawing upon the analysis of the perceptions of current ESL administrators pertaining to adequate administrative skills, appropriate training and preparation, and other related demographic data, competent answers will be provided to the following questions:

I. What kinds of administrative training do the master and doctoral ESL and applied linguistics graduate programs offer to their graduate students?

II. What are the responsibilities and problems an ESL or applied linguistics program director faces pertaining to the administrative aspects of the program?

III. Did the administrative training components, if any, of the program from which the ESL or applied linguistics programs directors graduated, provide them with the appropriate training for administrative duties?

IV. What level of satisfaction do current ESL and applied linguistics program directors have with the graduate training of the programs from which they graduated?

V. What is the relationship between the current directors' level of satisfaction and the perceived level of success of the master and doctoral ESL and applied linguistics programs in preparing them for their duties?

VI. What elements such as new courses and internships might be included in ESL master and doctoral programs to improve preparation for administrative responsibilities?

In order to be able to answer the aforementioned questions, your participation is very significant and invaluable. The participation of every current and former director of a graduate ESL or applied linguistics program is needed to help determine the adequacy of preparation of ESL and applied linguistics graduates for their anticipated duties including administration and publication. Again, your encouragement and participation will be sincerely appreciated. Please contact me if you would like to receive a copy of the questionnaire and contribute to the validity of this study. I can be reached at:

Anwar A. Hussein
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85280-2411
Tel. (602) 491-4014

APPENDIX E

LIST OF POPULATION OF THE STUDY REPRESENTED BY INSTITUTION

Institutions Surveyed	State Represented
Doctorate Granting Institutions	
Ball State University	Indiana
University of California	California
University of Colorado	Colorado
University of Delaware	Delaware
Florida State University	Florida
Georgetown University	District of Columbia
University of Hawaii, Manoa	Hawaii
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Illinois
Illinois State University	Illinois
Indiana University	Indiana
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania
University of Kansas	Kansas
University of Mississippi	Mississippi
University of New Mexico	New Mexico
New York University	New York
State University of New York, Buffalo	New York
State University of New York, Stony Brook	New York
Northern Arizona University	Arizona
Northern Illinois University	Illinois
Nova University	Florida
The Ohio State University	Ohio
University of Oregon	Oregon
The University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania
University of Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico
University of South Carolina	South Carolina
University of Southern California	California
Stanford University	California
Teachers College of Columbia University	New York
Temple University	Pennsylvania
University of Texas, Austin	Texas
Master's Granting Institutions	
Adelphi University	New York
University of Alabama	Alabama
The American University	District of Colombia
University of Arizona	Arizona
Arizona State University	Arizona
Azusa Pacific University	California
Ball State University	Indiana
Biola University	California
Boston University	Massachusetts

Institutions Surveyed	State Represented
Master's Granting Institutions	
Bowling Green State University	Ohio
Brigham Young University	Utah
University of California, Davis	California
University of California, Los Angeles	California
California State University, Dominguez Hills	California
California State University, Fresno	California
California State University, Fullerton	California
California State University, Long Beach	California
California State University, Northridge	California
California State University, Sacramento	California
Central Connecticut State University	Connecticut
Central Missouri State University	Missouri
University of Colorado, Boulder	Colorado
University of Colorado, Denver	Colorado
Colorado State University	Colorado
Corpus Christi State University	Texas
University of Delaware	Delaware
East Carolina University	North Carolina
Eastern College	Pennsylvania
Eastern Michigan University	Michigan
Eastern Washington University	Washington
Fairfield University	Connecticut
Fairleigh Dickinson University	New Jersey
Florida International University	Florida
Florida State University	Florida
Fordham University, Lincoln Center	New York
Fresno Pacific College	California
George Mason University	Virginia
Georgetown University	District of Columbia
University of Georgia	Georgia
Georgia State University	Georgia
Grand Canyon University	Arizona
University of Hawaii, Manoa	Hawaii
Hofstra University	New York
University of Houston	Texas
University of Houston, Clear Lake	Texas
Hunter College of the City University of New York	New York

Institution Surveyed	State Represented
Master's Granting Institutions	
University of Idaho	Idaho
University of Illinois, Chicago	Illinois
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Illinois
Illinois State University	Illinois
Indiana University	Indiana
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania
Inter American University of Puerto Rico San German Campus	Puerto Rico
Inter American University of Puerto Rico Metropolitan Campus	Puerto Rico
The University of Iowa	Iowa
Iowa State University	Iowa
Jackson State University	Mississippi
Jersey City State College	New Jersey
University of Kansas	Kansas
Lamar University	Texas
Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus	New York
Mankato State University	
University of Maryland, Baltimore County	Maryland
University of Maryland, College Park	Maryland
University of Massachusetts Amhurst	Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts Boston	Massachusetts
Memphis State University	Tennessee
University of Miami	Florida
Michigan State University	Michigan
University of Minnesota	Minnesota
University of Mississippi	Mississippi
University of Montana	Montana
The Monterey Institute of International Studies	California
Nazareth College	New York
National-Louis University	Illinois
University of Nevada, Reno	Nevada
University of New Hampshire	New Hampshire
University of New Mexico	New Mexico
New Mexico State University	New Mexico
College of New Rochelle	New York
New York University	New York
State University of New York, Albany	New York

Institution Surveyed	State Represented
Master's Granting Institutions	
State University of New York, Buffalo	New York
State University of New York, Stony Brook	New York
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	North Carolina
University of North Texas	Texas
Northeastern Illinois University	Illinois
Northern Arizona University	Arizona
Northern Illinois University	Illinois
University of Northern Iowa	Iowa
Notre Dame College	New Hampshire
Nova University	Florida
The Ohio State University	Ohio
Oklahoma State University	Oklahoma
Old Dominion University	Virginia
University of Oregon	Oregon
Oregon State University	Oregon
Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio	Texas
University of the Pacific	California
The University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania
The Pennsylvania State University	Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
Portland State University	Oregon
University of Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico
University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez Campus	Puerto Rico
Queens College of the City University of New York	New York
Radford University	Virginia
Rhode Island College	Rhode Island
University of Rochester	New York
Saint Michael's College	Vermont
Sam Houston State University	Texas
San Diego State University	California
University of San Francisco	California
San Francisco State University	California
San Jose State University	California
College of Santa Fe	New Mexico
School for International Training	Vermont
Seton Hall University	New Jersey
University of South Carolina	South Carolina
University of South Florida	Florida

Institution Surveyed	State Represented
Master's Granting Institutions	
Southeast Missouri State University	Missouri
University of Southern California	California
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Illinois
University of Southern Maine	Maine
University of Southern Mississippi	Mississippi
Stanford University	California
Syracuse University	New York
Teachers College of Columbia University	New York
Temple University	Pennsylvania
University of Texas at Arlington	Texas
University of Texas at Austin	Texas
University of Texas at El Paso	Texas
University of Texas at San Antonio	Texas
University of Texas-Pan American	Texas
Texas Women's University	Texas
University of Toledo	Ohio
Tulane University	Louisiana
United States International University	California
University of Utah	Utah
University of Washington	Washington
Washington State University	Washington
West Chester University	Pennsylvania
West Virginia University	West Virginia
Western Kentucky University	Kentucky
William Patterson College	New Jersey
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	Wisconsin
Wright State University	Ohio

APPENDIX F

CHI SQUARE STATISTICS TEST OF INDEPENDENCE

Table 1
Chi-Square Statistics
Test of Independence

Variables	df	Level of Significance	Critical Value	Computed Value
Place & Size	2	.01	9.21	5.534
	2	.05	5.99	5.534
Role & Size	2	.01	9.21	1.626
	2	.05	5.99	1.626
Length/ Effectiveness	2	.01	9.21	10.74
	2	.05	5.99	10.74
Satisfaction/ Effectiveness	2	.01	9.21	4.818
	2	.05	5.99	4.818